THE MATTHEAN PARABLES

SUPPLEMENTS TO

NOVUM TESTAMENTUM

EDITORIAL BOARD

C.K. Barrett, Durham - P. Borgen, Trondheim
J.K. Elliott, Leeds - H.J. de Jonge, Leiden
A.J. Malherbe, New Haven - M.J.J. Menken, Utrecht
D.P. Moessner, Atlanta - J. Smit Sibinga, Amsterdam

VOLUME LXXX

THE MATTHEAN PARABLES

A Literary and Historical Commentary

BY

IVOR H. JONES

E.J. BRILL
LEIDEN · NEW YORK · KÖLN
1995

The paper in this book meets the guidelines for permanence and durability of the Committee on Production Guidelines for Book Longevity of the Council on Library Resources.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Jones, Ivor H.
The Matthean parables : a literary and historical commentary / by Ivor H. Jones.
p. cm. — (Supplements to Novum Testamentum: v. 80)
Includes bibliographical references and indexes.
ISBN 9004101810 (cloth : alk. paper)
1. Jesus Christ—Parables. 2. Bible. N.T. Matthew Criticism, Interpretation, etc. I. Title. II. Series.
BT375.2.J83 1995
226.8'06—dc20 95-18707
CIP

Die Deutsche Bibliothek - CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

Jones, Ivor H.:
The Matthean parables : a literary and historical commentary / by Ivor H. Jones. – Leiden ; New York ; Köln : Brill, 1995
(Novum testamentum : Supplements ; Vol. 80)
ISBN 90-04-10181 0
[Novum testamentum / Supplements]
(Supplements to Novum testamentum. - Leiden ; New York ; Köln : Brill.
Früher Schriftenreihe
Fortlaufende Beiheftreihe zu : Novum testamentum
NE: HST
Vol. 80. Jones, Ivor H.: The Matthean parables. – 1995

ISSN 0167-9732
ISBN 90 04 10181 0

© Copyright 1995 by E.J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by E.J. Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910 Danvers MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

Preface and Acknowledgements VII
Abbreviations IX

Introduction 1

PART ONE

CHAPTER 1. Towards a New Genre Model 7

CHAPTER 2. What is a Parable? 56

CHAPTER 3. The Function of the Parables 110

PART TWO

CHAPTER 4. The Summary Parables 173

CHAPTER 5. The Chapter of Parables 282

CHAPTER 6. Parables and Marcan Contexts 359

CHAPTER 7. The Eschatological Parables 425

APPENDIX A Study in Syntax and Style 482

Bibliography 521

Index of Modern Authors 579
Index of Greek Words 587
Index of References to the Main Matthean Passages 593
Index of Subjects 595

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The work behind this volume began in 1960 when the author first read the articles of, and then listened to the lectures of, Professor Günther Bornkamm. For me, the fascination of Matthew's Gospel has lasted from that day to this. Professor Bornkamm commented generously on my early critique of his work and added with prophetic insight that the critique would take me a lifetime to complete. To other Heidelberg scholars I owe my entry into the world of extra-biblical Hebrew, Aramaic and Coptic texts. One of them, Karl Georg Kuhn, whose Qumran Arbeitsgemeinschaft left me astonished at the technical skills evinced there, added wrily that to cover the secondary material on the Matthean parables alone was task enough. Matthean scholarship has moved on, and what those two remarkable figures would have said of the present level of interest in Matthew's Gospel, and of the contributions their own pupils have made to Matthean study, I cannot imagine. It is a field in which everyone admits an unpayable debt to the publications of others.

Like all who are engaged in research I owe a great debt to librarians, who have provided invaluable assistance. These librarians, in Dr Williams's Library, in the University Libraries of Manchester, Bristol and Cambridge, and during the last fifteen years especially Herr Miltenberger in Heidelberg, have ensured a steady supply of the most recent material. Encouragement to work away at a vast area and to maintain good standards of practice has come from many of my colleagues: among so many of these, a few who must be mentioned are: the Revd. W.F. Flemington, Dr. Leslie Mitton, the Right Revd. Alan W. Webster, Professor Grayston, Dr. John Ziesler, Dr. Meg Davies, the Matthean group in the British Society of New Testament Studies and the Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas, Professor C.F.D. Moule (who read an early draft of the Appendix during my time at the Bishop's Hostel in Lincoln), Professor C.K. Barrett (whose queries at an early stage of the book's life launched me into yet deeper water), and in the last ten years that marvellous partnership of Dr. David Stacey and Professor Morna Hooker, and the stimulus of those who contribute to the envigorating context of Professor Hooker's New Testament Seminar and the Cambridge Faculty. Among the many Faculty members, I am particularly grateful to Dr. Janet Soskice for her work on 'metaphor' and for her valuable set of comments on the argument of Chapter Three. Dr. Horbury has given me invaluable advice and Dr. de Lacey provided computer material for me, including the statistical summary on pp.483-484.

During the 1960s the opportunities for those in Circuit and in Theological College work to gain from the stimulus of professional scholars were limited; hence my debt to those who gave personal advice and help then is all the greater. Colleagues gave me precious space during the occasional sabbatical and in the fragments of long vacations. Some of my time as a teacher has been spent learning to work with the text of Matthew in study groups both lay and ordained, in Britain and other parts of Europe, and to all those who shared in those sessions my genuine thanks are due. Dr. John Stacey gave me an early opportunity to lecture on Matthew, in the A.S. Peake Lecture in Hull, and some of the comments offered to me then by the Revd. Geoffrey Eddy and Dr. John Newton stimulated further study.

My family's feelings about this volume are necessarily mixed. They have lived with its demands over many years, and again and again given me room. Without them the research, the academic presentations, the papers, the lectures, the travel and the final book would have been quite impossible. Kathleen, Michael and Elisabeth have taught me more than I can ever say and their delight in the completion of the book is evidence of their relief and their affection. Iris, with my other sister Audrey, in the days when computer technology was only a tiny cloud on the horizon, used free time and holiday to transform my untidy scripts into elegant dissertations. They also helped to make the project feasible. Bobbie Coe in Cambridge has been an enormous help; without her expertise the project would have foundered. Rosemary Graham has read every word of the text and made innumerable corrections and improvements. To both of them I am extremely grateful.

My gratitude must go the staff of Brill and especially to Dr. David Orton and his co-editors for much patience, skill and advice during the three-year struggle to bring the manuscript to its final form. At several points in the process they could have given me up, but they did not do so. I can only express the hope that their generosity will prove justified.

The study of Matthew's Gospel is an enterprise of monumental proportions. Like the Sermon on the Mount, of which it is the wider context, Matthew's Gospel is one of the great intellectual and spiritual challenges of all time, summoning from humanity all our imagination and courage. It is a privilege to have had a tiny share in that response and to be allowed to publish a few findings.

Ivor H. Jones
Cambridge, August 1995.

ABBREVIATIONS

ATR	*Anglican Theological Review*
Bib	*Biblica*
BZ	*Biblische Zeitschrift*
BJRL	*Bulletin of the John Rylands Library in Manchester*
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CQ	*Classical Quarterly*
EpR	*Epworth Review*
EvQ	*Evangelical Quarterly*
EvT	*Evangelische Theologie*
ExpTim	*Expository Times*
GPet	*Gospel of Peter*
GThom	*Gospel of Thomas*
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
HUCA	*Hebrew Union College Annual*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JJS	*Journal of Jewish Studies*
JSNT	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
JSS	*Journal of Semitic Studies*
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
NovT	*Novum Testamentum*
NTS	*New Testament Studies*
POxy	*Oxyrhynchus Papyri*
RevB	*Revue biblique*
RevQ	*Revue de Qumrân*
SJT	*Scottish Journal of Theology*
ST	*Studia Theologica*
TDNT	*Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* edd. G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, trans. G.W.Bromiley.
TLZ	*Theologische Literaturzeitung*
ThR	*Theologische Rundshau*
TZ	*Theologische Zeitschrift*
TWNT	*Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZNW	*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZTK	*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*

Other abbreviated titles appear in the bibliography in bold type.

INTRODUCTION

Research on the Matthean parables can shed new light on the structure, purpose and genre of the Gospel of Matthew as a whole. That is the claim which we propose to examine in this book. If we study the disposition and distribution, the forms and language, the use and function of the Matthean parables, questions about the author's shaping of the Gospel come into fresh focus. A fresh focus on Matthew's Gospel is needed for a number of reasons. First, the traditional hypotheses are proving inadequate as more detailed and disciplined work on the vocabulary and style of the Gospel is published.[1] Second, the work of composition critics depends on the same basic literary assumptions which in the case of redaction criticism failed to produce secure and lasting results.[2] Third, the impact of structuralism on the study of the Gospels has raised profoundly important issues about Gospel interpretation. One of these is the issue of multivalent language. Do Matthean words and phrases have single or multiple reference points? Many commentaries and monographs assume the former without discussion, and their work appears to the modern literary critic over-precise.[3] That is not to say that the multivalent solution is necessarily right. As one recent monograph has shown, there has been a significant erosion of meaning in

---

[1] Bergemann, *Prüfstand*, uses Gramcord to suggest that neither the classical Q hypothesis nor the assumption of a redactor are adequate explanations of the linguistic findings. See also Downing, *Paradigm Perplex*; Mattila, *Question*; Denaux, *Criteria*.

[2] The differing interpretations of the five major Matthean discourses proposed by redaction critics since the 1950s indicate a lack of clear criteria in their method (see p.17 n.18). Composition critics have stated their dependence on redaction-critical work and have offered their own criteria, but again without a consensus. (See p.31 n.37 and Powell, *Plot*, 193, for his recognition of Kingsbury's work on Mt 4:17 and 16:21; see also the different ways in which the changes of address at the conclusions of the discourses are interpreted by Howell, *Inclusive*, 224 n.1; Davies, *Matthew*, 105; Wright, *People*, 386-390.) The use of implicit as well as explicit pointers to the structure of Matthew also threatens the objectivity of the method. Often the attempt to achieve overall consistency in the structuring of Matthew means the omission of important evidence: Thiemann, *Revelation*, 114-130, gives a cumulative reading of the narrative, but since 'promise' is the overall theme in his treatment of Matthew (132) the omission of the promise to Peter from that cumulative picture (124) is inexplicable. But it is the failure of both redaction and composition critics to examine the vulnerability of the literary hypothesis which concerns us here.

[3] See Davies, *Matthew*, II 760.

some of the New Testament metaphorical fields.[4] Fourth, hermeneutical study has thrown much light on the function of narrative in the Gospels.[5] The definition of 'narrative' will require careful attention at a later stage, especially the relationship of 'narrative' to theology. But at this stage it is the relationship of the narratives to the Gospel which is in question: What kind of relationship do story and Gospel, narrative and Kingdom have in Matthew, and what have individual stories by Jesus to do with the story about Jesus?[6] Fifth, and closely related to the last issue, is the question of Matthew's ideological stance. Many studies of this Gospel assume that the author is driven by a firm, ideological position which is expressed in a directive and didactic form or in the equally directive but more subtle form of expectation and suggestion. It is however possible that Matthew's approach is rather different, that it encourages a reflective and discursive attitude to personal and corporate responsibilities.[7] Sixth, sociological study of the social relationships implied in the text of Matthew has led to significantly different interpretations of Matthew.[8] Realistic conflict, social identity and deviancy theories have suggested models by which to illuminate the relationship of Matthean Christianity to the Judaism of its day, and these have thrown fresh light on the possible functions of the text. Fundamental to all these attempts is the question of the inner consistency of the Matthean material: are we dealing with a text which has a single perspective sustained by a single community, or various perspectives sustained by various communities drawn together as part of the Gospel writer's policy? All these seven areas bear on the question of genre: the theory of a biographical genre for Matthew depends in part on the assumption of a literary intention and purpose for the Gospel. If its literary intention is questioned, can the theory of a biographical genre stand, and if it cannot stand, what should replace it?

Within that range of problems a concentration on the Matthean parables has much to commend it. The parables are identifiable units whose form and whose function in relation to their immediate context and to the wider context of the Gospel can be objectively described. They have also been a primary area for the study of tradition and redaction. Four of the parables fulfil a specific structural role. The parables exhibit various levels of metaphorical language, operating in different ways;[9] all of them have been submitted to a range of structural analysis, and they belong to a rich vein of picture language in Matthew's Gospel. Furthermore, some of the longer

---

[4] von Gemünden, *Vegetationsmetaphorik*.
[5] Powell, *Narrative*, 44-51.
[6] Williams, *Parable*; Kingsbury, *Story*, 136; Milbank, *Theology*, 387.
[7] Thysman, *Communauté*.
[8] Stanton, *Gospel*.
[9] Erlemann, *Gleichnissen*.

parables are specifically linked to the Kingdom, providing different perspectives on that Matthean motif and offering material for a discussion of narrative and theology in Matthew. They are a significant form of ethical teaching and it has been suggested that they operate as a counterbalance to law and institution within Matthew; they subvert rather than sustain ideology. On the relationship of the Matthean community to contemporary Jewish religious life the parables in chs. 21-22 are important evidence, particularly when they present the replacement motif: '...the kingdom of God will be taken away from you and given to a people who produce its fruit' (21:43).[10] The parables appear to come from different traditions and in some cases represent different attitudes to piety and discipline. As far as genre is concerned, some claim that the parable is definitive of the Gospel genre. For our purposes the parables are an ideal means of narrowing down the area of research.

The claim that a study of the parables in Matthew can throw light on the structure, intention and genre of the Matthean Gospel does of course have to make major assumptions. It assumes a particular role for the written Gospel. It assumes that what is written codifies what an individual voice has announced, offering what was spoken and what was written for consideration and response by others. It also assumes that the written work has a meaning which is not disconnected from what the writer might have said it meant, and that it carries structural indications which may help us to identify its intended meaning, at least in part.[11] These are major assumptions; but in the view of many they are justified, and to argue them here would require extended prolegomena.

One area of assumptions will need detailed examination. It is one thing to suggest that the parables are units whose form and function can be described, and quite another to name those forms and evaluate their significance. Some writers on Matthew's Gospel concentrate exclusively on one particular kind of parable,[12] usually that which is extended and has at least within it the beginning of a narrative: they deal only with the 'parable proper'. But for our purpose, which includes an evaluation of Matthean levels of metaphor, that is insufficient, and we must include in our study all the available forms of picture language.

The evaluation of the Matthean parables needs attention from other points of view also. How do they relate to allegory, to alternative versions of the story available from other sources, and to theories of 'performance' according to which originating parabolic structures might possess continuity

---

[10] Saldarini, *Community*, 58-64; Sim, *Gentiles*.
[11] Murdoch, *Metaphysics*, 185-216; Thiselton, *Hermeneutics*, 55-74.
[12] Lambrecht, *Treasure*, 22-23.

with later written forms?[13] These are all areas which require clarification if the study of the parables is to yield insights into the Gospel as a whole.

Our initial claim is therefore a complex one. But in one respect the method it recommends is simple and obvious. There is a great deal of parabolic material in Matthew, and to study it in detail is to cover considerable tracts of the Gospel. The parables are distributed widely across the face of the Gospel, and the vocabulary contained in them cannot be regarded as unrepresentative of the Gospel as a whole. Taking such a large expanse of text as that afforded by the parables we hope to contribute to a reliable picture of Matthean style and to show that this helps to clarify the intention, purpose and genre of the Gospel. Such an operation by its very size creates its own problems. It requires here a division of the study into two parts: an exposition of our initial claim (Part One) and a literary and historical commentary on the parables containing the detail necessary to support that claim (Part Two).

---

[13] Scott, *Parable*, 76.

PART ONE

CHAPTER ONE

TOWARDS A NEW GENRE MODEL

During recent discussion of the relationships between the Synoptic Gospels there has been a progressive refinement of the traditional hypotheses. But in that process of refinement their weaknesses have become evident. This chapter reviews the refining of synoptic literary study, especially in relation to redaction, source, rhetorical and composition criticism, the appearance of weaknesses within the literary method, and the problems which this creates for the current study of Gospel genre. The chapter concludes with a suggestion for a way forward out of the impasse.

We begin with a review of the literary study of Matthew's Gospel during the last fifty years and the refinements which have proved necessary. Redaction criticism was an attempt to study the Gospel writer's intentions, setting and beliefs. Traditionally it involved identifying a writer's distinctive literary style, methods of selecting and organizing material, and main emphases; by this means an editor's influence could be monitored at each point in the work, and answers provided to such questions as: What was the author's intention? In what circumstances was the work written? What beliefs motivated its composition?

This was how redaction criticism was understood, as for example when Bornkamm began his seminal work on Matthew's Gospel.[1] Bornkamm studied the five great addresses (chs. 5-7, 10, 13, 18, 24-25). In his view Matthew had built them out of the traditions available to him, Mark's Gospel, Q, and his own special source, M. By comparing the text of Matthew with Mark and Q, Bornkamm identified the changes which Matthew had introduced; for instance, Mt 4:17 and Mt 3:2 agree against Mk 1:15 and Mk 1:4 in making repentance before the coming judgment the same primary concern for both John the Baptist and Jesus. This emphasis Bornkamm discovered throughout all the five addresses. All of the five urge upon the church particular responsibilities in face of the coming judgment. In this way Bornkamm claimed to have isolated the main theological ideas which had motivated Matthew to write a Gospel.

This example from Bornkamm's work represents redaction criticism in the early stages of its development. Two early features are worth noting.

---

[1] See Bornkamm, *Enderwartung*, 13-47 (ET *End-expectation*, 15-51).

Bornkamm assumed that he knew the exact text of Matthew's sources. So he was confident that he could monitor Matthew's alterations exactly (as in the case of Mt 4:17 which differs from the parallel in Mk 1:15, and Mt 3:2 which differs from the parallel in Mk 1:4, or, to use the common abbreviations, Mt 4:17 Diff Mk 1:15, and Mt 3:2 Diff Mk 1:4), and by this means could plot Matthew's method of compilation. He could also assume that the main question to be asked was what Matthew believed. The circumstances which might have attended Matthew's own life mattered less than the standpoint of faith from which Matthew wrote. In these respects Bornkamm's work represented an early stage in the literary-critical method and it began to reveal problematic areas in that method: assumptions about the nature of Matthew's sources and about Matthew's theological approach to writing a Gospel. It was nevertheless a seminal piece of work, and its influence has lasted already some fifty years.

In the intervening years there has been a refinement of the literary-critical method through more satisfactory ways of studying an author's style. Two particular lines of research have been fruitful. First, the original system for presenting linguistic findings used by Conzelmann, Bornkamm and Marxsen and their pupils, had to be extended. The original system was designed to deal with divergences noted in the Gospel text over against the author's presumed sources. As the possible contributory influence of oral tradition began to be explored the original system of presentation had to be adapted accordingly.[2] The new factors needed representation in the statistical data. Second, there was the fresh attention to the foundational work of Hawkins's *Horae Synopticae*. Hawkins had collected a mass of evidence regarding the stylistic usage of the Gospel writers, and this needed updating, and in places correction. His work also needed clarification: when Hawkins described an item of vocabulary as 'Matthean' he did not specify precisely what he meant by that term, whereas more recent attention to that material has tended to give it a clear and precise reference. Goulder,[3] for example, took Hawkins's designation 'Matthean' to mean a feature of the final author's personal style. He was working, more deliberately than Hawkins, with the model of a literary creator, an author whose style and vocabulary could be recognized by statistically significant word usage, and this allowed Goulder to treat usage

---

[2] Strecker, *Gerechtigkeit* (1962), 14 especially: 'Allerdings ist zu beachten, daß die schriftlichen Quellen nicht mechanisch abgegrenzt werden können, vielmehr bei Abweichungen mit dem Einfluß vor allem mündlicher Tradition gerechnet werden muß; dann ist auch die Redaktortätigkeit nicht einfach zu isolieren...die Einheit von Redaktion und Tradition anzuerkennen ist'. See Kilpatrick, *Origins*, 57-58.

[3] Goulder, *Midrash*, 476; Hawkins, *Horae*, 138; see also Davies, *Matthew*, I 77-79.

falling below statistically significant levels as irrelevant. The exclusion of such material brings an element of circularity into his argument, since the statistically insignificant evidence is what particularly points to the presence of traditional material in Matthew. By excluding that he also excluded any other explanation except that of creative authorship.

Gaston's *Horae Synopticae Electronicae* offered a different refinement of Hawkins's work. In judging whether or not a word occurs unusually frequently in a particular Gospel, source or form, Gaston improved on Hawkins by defining 'unusual frequency', by reviewing each of the items of vocabulary under the separate categories of source and form, and by including a wider range of data relevant to editorial decisions (e.g. editorial work in Q as well as final editorial work in each of the Gospels). Gaston was therefore working with a more flexible model; he allowed the data to indicate if a final editor could be bringing together previously existent units with their own distinctive vocabulary.

These refinements are important. They illustrate the increasing care which has been given to the technique of language analysis during recent decades. But both Goulder and Gaston assumed the appropriateness of levels of usage to decisions about synoptic authorship. They may have set the levels differently; but for both of them the levels are the critical factor. However, some experts in authorial statistics[4] make a distinction between creative authorial responsibility and traditional literary responsibility; they favour the view that in the case of a literary work which is traditional in character, the suggested levels of usage by which normal authorial responsibility might be considered do not apply. That some statisticians make that distinction is sufficient ground for an initially inclusive approach (one which leaves open the issue of tradition or redaction) rather than an exclusive approach to synoptic linguistic data.

Part of Gaston's improved method was an attempt to identify areas of Matthew's Gospel which might be classified as redactional on other than linguistic grounds so that these might be confirmed as redactional by the linguistic data. A more rigorous attempt to do this was Tevis's development of Hawkins's work.[5] Tevis recognized that to show that a phrase is characteristic of a single writer is more difficult than to show that it is characteristic of a Gospel. So he attempted to solve the difficulty by working with two groups of words, phrases and constructions. The first group was composed of fifty-two items, which he judged: 1) characteristic of the Gospel, 2) well distributed, and 3) occurring in passages that function redactionally. The second group was composed of thirty-seven items and

[4] I am indebted to the Bristol University School of Mathematics for research in this area on my behalf.

[5] Tevis, *Analysis*, 14-17, 299-302.

these he judged to be: 1) characteristic of the Gospel, and 2) appearing in the same immediate context as words and phrases which occur in passages which function redactionally. The method had the advantage that it attempted to establish a link between the distribution of particular words and phrases across the Gospel and their use in passages which function redactionally.

There are structurally significant passages with clusters of possibly redactional vocabulary and syntax (4:23-25 is an example of this). However, the problem inherent in Tevis's method is how to produce a general definition of redactional passages. The three categories of material identified by Tevis as redactional all include traditional features: the first category of material comprises the Old Testament quotations[6] and formulae such as 11:15, 13:9, 19:30 and 20:16; the second, the condensed summaries, comprise four sections with close Marcan parallels alongside the six stereotyped healing summaries and two introductions (3:1; 16:21); and third, the transitional material, which includes the five formulae concluding the discourses,[7] seven verses from the Infancy Narrative, and a number of

---

[6] Dr Graham Davies, in a paper to Professor Hooker's Cambridge Seminar during the Lent Term 1994 (*'Did Matthew know Hebrew?'*), pointed to Hellenistic traditions and translations, suggesting patterns and techniques on which the text form of the 'formula quotations' may be dependent. Recently, in a paper to the British NT Seminar on the use of OT in the NT, I have illustrated ways in which a majority of the 'formula quotations' owes more to tradition and to scribal work, Jewish and Christian, than to a single editor.

[7] Mt 7:28 differs in one respect from the other four sayings-collection summaries. Mt 7:28, alone of the five Matthean conclusions to the sayings-collections, represents an un-Hebraic imitation of the Semitic construction reflected in the others (11:1; 13:53; 19:1; 26:1); see Beyer, *Syntax*, 29-62. This particular Semitic idiom occurs in the New Testament: Mt 4x No Par; Mk (1:9) 1x Diff Mt; Lk 13x No Par; 10x Diff Mk; 1x Diff Mt; Acts 6x (see pp.11f for these abbrevations). Deviations from the Semitic construction appear in three groups:
1) Mt 9:10 (minuscule 700); Mk 2:23 (minuscule 472); 14:4 (BA) Diff Mt (Mt omits ἐγένετο); Lk 8x No Par; 4x Diff Mk.
2) Lk 3:21 Diff Mk; 9:18 Diff Mk; 11:1 No Par; 17:11f No Par; 19:15 Diff Mt.
3) Mk 2:15 (BA); 2:23 (BD); Lk 6:1ff Par Mk (2:23); 9:29 (DA) Diff Mk; Acts 4x.
Un-Hebraic imitations of the Semitic construction appear:
Mt 7:28 No Par or Diff Lk; 9:10 (BD) Diff Mk (Mk has καὶ γίνεται κατακεῖσθαι); Mk 2:15 (minuscule 579); Lk 3x No Par; 1x Diff Mk; 1x Diff Mt (Lk 19:15); Acts 6x. Of these, Mt 9:10 (BD) expresses duration (Beyer, *Syntax*, 52 n.2; 58 n.1), and replaces a Marcan use (2:15 BA).
Why then does Mt 7:28 differ from the other sayings-collection summaries? The main point to which Beyer is drawing attention is the change of subject between the initial Verb (ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν) and the main Verb, a change which only occurs in 7:28. An explanation of this feature could well be the editor's need to bring the concluding phrase of the discourse material (compare 7:28a with Lk 7:1a) into line with the summary statement in Mk 1:22, a procedure which would

section openings where the linguistic material has highly traditional features. Furthermore, not only has Tevis classified as redactional some passages which contain traditional features, his discussion of the three hundred words, phrases and constructions is not thorough enough. It is essential, if we are to make a judgment on Matthean style, that each example of syntax should be located within the history of that item of syntax. Such a history should include examples before, during and after the writing of the Synoptic Gospels. Only within such a history can a judgment be made whether or not a Matthean usage should be classified as normal or distinctive. One Matthean item of syntax listed by Tevis as distinctive is a form of the Genitive Absolute construction. The historical survey of the use of this construction appended to this book shows the danger in isolating a particular example of a construction from the history of that construction and calling it redactional. The point can be stated in another way. Some time ago Lars Hartman offered an overview of all the participial constructions in the synoptic material, including the Genitive Absolute; he concluded that many of the items now referred to as Matthean preferences were the common stock of oral tradition.[8] His evidence confirms that individual items of syntax need to be considered in a historical perspective. So from two points of view Tevis's refinement of Hawkins's work is unsatisfactory: he classifies as redactional some passages which include traditional forms of expression, and he classifies as redactional some items of syntax which a wider context would suggest are part of stock usage.

These refinements in the study of synoptic language have been reflected in the presentation and interpretation of linguistic data.[9] The early redaction critics used a form of statistical presentation with the following headings: Mt Par Mk indicates where Matthew has the item of vocabulary in a section parallel to Mark, Mt Diff Mk indicates where Matthew has that item in a section parallel to Mark but where Mark lacks that specific item. This is a neat form of data presentation, but it is open to misinterpretation in two ways: first, it is not entirely objective, since the phrase 'a section parallel to Mark' has been understood and applied in different ways by those adhering to

---

have resulted in the change of subject. Since all the other four summary conclusions retain the same subject (Jesus) in both parts, in some cases because the Marcan basis suggested this (Mt 13:53//Mk 6:1; Mt 19:1//Mk 10:1; 26:1 may be indebted to Deut 31:24 LXX), 7:28 emerges as a unique formation among the five formulae. Such a solution however would require the summary statement in 7:28, and perhaps 13:53 and 19:1 also, to be the redactor's bringing together of Mark and the discourse material. It is of course a question how much weight can be placed on a syntactical point of this kind in a judgment on editorial matters. However, the traditional character of the formula is extremely probable.

[8] Hartman, *Testimonium Linguae*, 5-56; Cadbury, *HTR*, 57 (1965), 164-165.

[9] Schürmann, *Untersuchungen*, 116-125.

different solutions of the synoptic problem; second, the heading Mt Diff Mk is not an indication of Matthean editorial preference, even when it is used frequently of a particular item of vocabulary or syntax, but is only a description of what appears on the page of the New Testament Synopsis. Mt Diff Mk can of course be given a fuller evaluation, but that fuller evaluation has to be made in the light of a much wider band of evidence: possible synonyms, alternatives, equivalents and their places in the map of synoptic usages.[10] The map of synoptic usages has to be as complete as possible; it is not sufficient to use only the classifications Mt Par Mk, Mt Diff Mk. If this system of data presentation is to be used, in the case of each item the following classifications have to be added: Mt Par Mk, Mt Diff Mk, Mt Par Lk, Mt Diff Mk, and also all the other possible relationships, including Mk Diff Mt (where Mark uses the item in material parallel with Matthew but where Matthew lacks that specific item) and Lk Diff Mt (where Luke uses that item in a section parallel with Matthew but where Matthew lacks that item). A further set of symbols is also advisable in order to differentiate cases where within a particular passage one Gospel differs from another by the absence of a single word under consideration: Mk >* or Lk >* or Mt >*. All these classifications are descriptive and provide nothing more than a map of the synoptic relationships regarding each item. For the evaluation of the 'map' a general theory of Matthean usage has to be developed. One contribution to such a general theory will be statistical calculations which measure the relative frequency of words and phrases in relation to the total text length and vocabulary stock of each Gospel, but even those calculations do no more than suggest vocabulary which a Gospel may prefer. Other factors, such as a concentration of these words and phrases in a particular passage, are necessary before the designation 'redactional preference' can be used.

It will be apparent from this that the substantial body of linguistic evidence gathered by various authors from Matthew's Gospel has to be treated with considerable caution. Some lists are suspect in themselves. The Greek Index which Gundry uses as evidence for Matthean usage[11] has serious omissions which render his conclusions untrustworthy. There is, for example, no reference to the examples where Matthew's 'favourite terminology' is found in Mark and Luke, but omitted in the parallel passages in Matthew.[12] Such negative evidence, evidence which counts against a redactional theory, is often neglected; it is however important, and frequent use will be made of it in this book. Even where lists are reliable there are logical difficulties involved in using them. Davies and Allison, for

[10] Bergemann, *Prüfstand*, 61-66.
[11] Gundry, *Matthew*, 1-4.
[12] Payne, *Midrash*, 189.

example, take great care in the body of their commentary to discuss the distribution of key lexical items across the Gospel and the localized use of other items, but sometimes they judge Matthean passages as redactional which have no synoptic parallel even though the linguistic evidence there is no stronger than in other Matthean passages which have an exact synoptic parallel and are unlikely to have been created by Matthew.[13] Usually in those cases the reason for the redactional judgment is based on other grounds, perhaps the structural function of the passage or one of its stylistic features. But the greater the difficulty experienced in giving an appropriate weighting to the linguistic lists, and the greater the likelihood of traditional factors affecting the stylistic formulations of the Gospel, the fewer will be the occasions when judgments about redactional activity can objectively be made.[14]

---

[13] Davies, *Matthew*, I 190-195 and 271-274, relate to Mt 2:22; it is treated as the point where narrative tradition (2:19-21) gives way to redaction, but in numerical terms, and using the Allen–Hawkins lists, there are fewer 'Matthean' vocabulary features in 2:22 than appear in Mt 6:30 (a verse of the same length) where the 'Matthean' features are shared with Luke, or in 6:25 where the parallel with Luke is virtually word for word and the description 'traditional' is judged appropriate. Why should not equal weighting be given in all cases to the 'Matthean' elements, and all or none declared redactional? Second, in their discussion of 5:14 and 5:21 Davies and Allison judge the former to be redactional and the latter traditional, although by their own statistics there is little difference between the two; and according to a fuller presentation of synoptic usage (taking into account Luke's uses of lexical and syntactical items against Matthew, and Mark's uses against Matthew) they would both qualify as traditional. Many of the decisions which Davies and Allison make are based on a balance of linguistic and structural considerations. In this last case one of the factors leading them to a judgment that 5:14 is redactional is the parallelism with 5:13. But that particular judgment rests on the prior assumption that structural parallelism implies redaction rather than tradition, which may or may not be justified. The stronger the case for traditional material on linguistic grounds (and the wider the band of statistical data considered, the stronger the case becomes) the weaker becomes the case for structural parallelism as redactional, both in this particular case and as a general working hypothesis in Matthew's Gospel as a whole.

[14] Chilton, *God in Strength*, 32, recognizes that accuracy in judgments about redaction would only be possible if we knew the sources being used. His eight guidelines involve studying: 1) the relation of a word to customary vocabulary; 2) the relation of syntax to customary style; 3) the relation of a phrase to prominent themes; 4) redundancy caused by the use of a phrase; 5) how essential a phrase is to the story being told; 6) the conflict of a phrase with the story being told; 7) inconsistency with 'schemes' of presentation; 8) evidence of a pre-redactional complex. These are useful guidelines and will be employed in Part Two. But their implementation is often open to debate. In the case of 1), for example, 'customary vocabulary' should include Matthean 'customary usage'; but to understand the phrase in that way in relation to Matthean time references

So far, objective evidence for redactional activity in Matthew has proved difficult to identify. It is very likely that there is traditional material in Matthew, and once that likelihood is accepted, linguistic evidence for

---

gives a different result from that envisaged by Chilton. The Matthean time indications have never been presented fully, and the only adequate discussion of them is in Ogawa, *L'histoire*. The section openings in Matthew's Gospel are introduced by a distinctive technique of overlapping formulae, which are used in order to provide a general sense of continuity between the sections, but without clearly defined differences of sense and function among the formulae; so it is not possible to say that a final editor has deliberately chosen one rather than another. A satisfactory study of the time references involves: 1) an examination of the following phrases by source-critical analysis of the kind described on p.11, together with a survey of their uses in canonical and non-canonical material: ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ, ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ, ἀπὸ τῆς ὥρας ἐκείνης, ἐν ταῖς ἡμεραῖς ἐκείναις, ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, τότε. 2) The data also has to be checked against MS variations. So, for example, Thompson, *Divided Community*, 133, claims that ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ in 18:1a is an example of editorial asyndeton. In 11:25; 12:1; 14:1; 22:23; 13:1 the MSS include in all cases paratactic readings. Despite a tendency in the MS tradition to avoid asyndeton, Mt 3:1, an apparently editorial paratactic opening, includes in its MS evidence asyndetic readings. In 18:1a also, claims for editorial choice of vocabulary are difficult to sustain against the MS evidence. ὥρᾳ has textual competition in 18:1; 8:13; 10:19 (minuscules 700 and 1424 have a tendency in that direction); the reverse is found in 22:23, where ημερα is probably the original text but 1574 and 1606 read ωρα, as 1606 does in 22:46. The same confusion reigns in the LXX: Esther 8:1; 9:2 and Gen 21:22. This is only to be expected when καιρός, ἡμέρα, χρόνος and ὥρα are used as variant translations (Wilch, *Time*, 152). In the light of this MS evidence it would be unwise to make too precise distinctions between stock introductory time phrases. 3) Another problem is that the phrases have a range of translations available for them (see Barr, *Biblical Words*, 127). So ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ in 26:55 might mean 'immediately thereafter', as ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ probably does in Esther 8:1 and Lk 2:38 (see Jeremias, *ZNW*, 42 (1949)). Jeremias treats αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρα as an Aramaism, and regards ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ as an equivalent phrase in somewhat better Greek. The Aramaic phrase has a range of meanings which Jeremias parallels in the New Testament appearances of its Greek counterparts: (i) at the same moment, (ii) at the very time, (iii) immediately after, (iv) once, (v) at once, (vi) without delay, (vii) on the spot, (viii) suddenly, (ix) at the decisive moment. Jeremias classifies 26:55 under (iii), 9:22, 15:28, 17:18 and 22:46 (ἀπ' ἐκείνης τῆς ἡμέρας) under (v), and 18:1 under (iv); he also illustrates (iii), (v) and (ix) from Greek Old Testament texts and from non-biblical Greek. This range of possible translations makes the editorial use sometimes claimed for these time phrases even more difficult to establish (on the parallel problem in Luke, see Black, *Aramaic* (1967^3), 108ff; Rehkopf, *Sonderquelle*, 92; Schürmann, *Rehkopf*, 266ff). The Matthean time indications encourage a sense of continuity, and would function aurally in this way; but it may well be unwise to use the time indications as firm evidence for more specific literary and theological judgments regarding the intentions behind their use. How Chilton's guidelines are used in judgments about redaction is clearly problematic.

editorial work cannot stand alone. It becomes necessary to attempt a correlation of linguistic and structural evidence. But such an attempt is fraught with problems. The refinements and improvements of earlier methods have suggested that, alongside carefully assessed statistical data, each item of vocabulary or syntax requires a map of synoptic usage; but that the map cannot be interpreted apart from a general theory of how the editor operated. A further complication is introduced by the structuralist arguments that the language of a written document such as Matthew's Gospel can only be studied in an intertextual context. The pattern of relationships between each item of vocabulary in Matthew and the parallels in the Gospels should be used to provide a grid through which the signs can be read and structured, and salient features of the text can be picked out. A proper evaluation of the vocabulary of Matthew has to include many more features than a map-like description can produce. A reference work of such relationships has been prepared by Schenk[15] and reference will be made to this throughout our studies. Unfortunately when Schenk comes to present the statistical material there is in his use of data a less flexible approach to the process of comparison than his theory requires. Intertextuality implies that different kinds of tradition influence the way in which the language operates, but his use of the symbol Q to designate areas of agreement between Matthew and Luke must surely be taken to imply that those agreements have to be based on a literary text. His practice proves to be less flexible than his theory.

No procedure can guarantee success in such a complex field; indeed the evidence which Bergemann has produced and which coincides with my own not merely suggests that identifying redactional work by linguistic means is difficult; it suggests that the interference by the editor in using traditional material may have been far more limited than many scholars have assumed. In the case of the Sermon on the Mount, vocabulary and syntax identifiable as redactional according to the stringent and logically acceptable standards of modern tests are unevenly spread and sporadic. What the redactor received and what the redactor transmitted may not have been all that different. All the more reason then that this study of the Matthean parables should use methods of analysis which keep open the possibility that the Gospel was using traditional material and that the level of redactional work in Matthew is itself open to question. The redaction-critical discipline has to be exercised in a more thorough, logical and methodical way, using at least three levels of information: the statistical checks offered by Bergemann, the intertextual material provided by Schenk, and a detailed map of intersynoptic relationships. Neirynck provides some basic reference material[16] to assist in

[15] Schenk, *Sprache*, 2-3.
[16] Neirynck, *Vocabulary*.

building up the map, but the detail of how the map can be prepared and how it can be evaluated must be reserved for the end of this chapter.

The study of Matthew's compositional techniques has also been refined during the last fifty years. As we saw earlier, Bornkamm understood Matthew's main compositional technique to have been the organization of Mark, Q and M. In each of the five main discourses in Matthew, Bornkamm could see the author at work constructing major units of material from his sources. More recently it has become increasingly difficult to determine the sources and the text of the sources which Matthew may have used. Even supposing these sources to be Mark and Q, we cannot be sure that Matthew used our canonical Mark, nor can we be sure what text of Q he used, if there ever was an identifiable Q source. One of the reasons for this basic uncertainty is the difficulty in explaining the total variants between our canonical Mark and our canonical Matthew: should they be interpreted as elements in a single, consistent pattern of editing, or as indications of several levels of tradition brought together by an end-redactor?[17] The same can be asked of the use of Q material in Matthew's Gospel. Can it be said that the use of Q in Matthew allows us to assume a coherent and consistent impression of the editor? It is fascinating that Gundry should have had to resort to the theory that Matthew 'tired' of his work. It is a lame solution which suggests scholarly exhaustion in the effort to make sense of all the shifts supposed to have taken place between a hypothetical Q text and the present text of Matthew's Gospel. The adjectives 'coherent and consistent' are notoriously difficult to define, especially in a redactional context. Coherence could mean an identifiable perspective or ideology, or a recognizable similarity of procedure and method, or a vocabulary and style belonging to a known context. Each of those provides its own difficulties when applied to Matthean redactional activity. On the other hand, to assume that all variants between Mark and Matthew can be subsumed under a single perspective, method and style poses its own problems. It could result in some inconsistencies being suppressed or misread because of a prior assumption.

A brief consideration of the so-called 'Chapter of Discipline' illustrates these difficulties. We have already seen the linguistic challenge which has

[17] See Jones, *Matthew*, for an interpretation of the Gospel in the light of the second option, with end-redaction understood as a process involving the conservation of different traditions, their memorization and their partial harmonization, resulting in a written document based on that process, so that the traditions remain represented in the final text but within the wider context of what different Christian communities have transmitted. Chapter Three presents the evidence for this viewpoint, organized under the seven headings of the Introduction.

been mounted against a heavy redactional involvement of the Gospel writer in the Sermon on the Mount; a similar although by no means identical case can be made with regard to Matthew 18. Despite a sequence of special studies devoted to this chapter, after nearly half a century scholars are as divided as ever about the organization and composition of this chapter.[18]

[18] The history of redaction criticism in Matthew 18 exposes several problems of method. A summary illustrates this: Bornkamm (1960 lectures) sees Jewish commitment, shaped in early community rules to the word and presence of Jesus, as an agenda for redaction-critical study in this chapter. Trilling (*Wahre Israel* 1962) treats the four sections as thematically ordered. Bonnard (*Matthieu* 1963) parallels the Matthean Christ with the rabbi of Matthew's own time who teaches by swift successive touches and images, not by discursive structures. Pesch (*Seelsorger* 1966) sees the discourse as formed from seven existing units and bound together by introductions, bridges and summaries of Matthew's own making (18:1,4,7,14,21a,35), the discourse illustrating Matthew's literary and pastoral method. Grundmann (*Matthäus* 1968) treats 17:24-27 as a presentation of the order and life of Jesus' community; a pre-Matthean narrative has been shaped to show the freedom of God's sons from the Law and Temple; that concern is continued in ch. 18. Thompson (*Divided Community* 1970) sees the literary unit as starting with 17:22-23, and as addressed to all members of the Matthean community. Bornkamm (*Die Binde- und Lösegewalt* 1970) takes his discussion further: the Lord Jesus, fulfilling and interpreting the Torah, undergirds the authority of the church with Peter guaranteeing its teaching; from that teaching a 'rule for the congregation' emerges, reflecting the strained encounter between Hellenistic and Jewish Christian traditions; the church draws on its heritage as an element corrective of enthusiasm, and breaks through its former boundaries as the synagogue ceases to be any longer an adequate analogy for its life and understanding. Frankemölle (*Jahwebund* 1973) expounds the relationships between the sons of the Kingdom who enjoy the presence of their exalted Lord, as Israel enjoyed the presence of Yahweh; this involves an understanding of brotherhood characteristic of Deuteronomy. Thysman (*Communauté* 1974) presents the principles of pastoral service to the community, with the disciplinary rules being prefaced and followed by material which prevents them from being used simply as procedure. Schweizer (*Matthäus* 1974, *Matthew* 1976) interprets ch. 18 as helping the Christian community to live as a community of Christ on the basis of God's inconceivably greater grace (18:21-35), so the church consists of those who say 'Yes' to Jesus in their deeds. Hill (*Matthew* 1975) sees the disciple here as more sectarian than rabbinic and the function of the parable is to indicate that in matters of personal differences the giving of pardon takes precedence over orderliness. Green (*Matthew* 1975) applies 'little ones' to all disciples but probably the term has been used disparagingly of those who sat loose to the individual precept of the Law; the issue is one of spiritual greatness (18:1-4). Zimmermann (*Mt 18* 1976) treats ch. 18 not so much as 'church order' as 'advice on how the church should correspond to the Kingdom', providing not its outer but its 'inner structure'. Dunn (*Unity and Diversity* 1977) stresses that the 'rule' lays responsibility on all to bring back the lost, to bind and to loose; all, not just Peter, are so authorized (18:18-19); so Peter is a representative figure not a hierarchical one, within a brotherhood grouped around

They propose different answers to the synoptic problem, different themes for the discourse, and different relationships between the discourse and its context. As scholars work their way through the chapter to the point in the chapter where the Marcan parallels thin out and disappear for a time, suggestions about the themes and the composition become even more divergent. Some regard the Matthean 'omission' of Mk 9:38 and 9:41 as significant; others make little of it. Some regard the issue of discipline as central; others the issue of forgiveness and brotherly love. Some explain

---

the 'elder brother' Jesus (18:20) and striving to develop an outgoing and all-member ministry amid Jewish hostility. Künzel (*Studien* 1978) brings together the concerns of eschatology, ecclesiology and Christology, with a particular emphasis on the pastoral primacy of Peter. Beare (*Matthew* 1981) sees Matthew deprecating any kind of insistence on rank and dignity and, as the final parable shows, illustrating the absurdity of refusing to forgive the infinitely lighter injuries we receive from each other when we have been forgiven so much by God. Gundry (*Matthew* 1982, 1994) finds here a concern with brotherhood in the church, and within the chapter sub-topics flow one into another almost imperceptibly. According to Davies and Allison (*Matthew* 1992) the chapter achieves a thematic unity leading from concern with children in 18:1-5 to the related concern with all believers in 18:9-14. We can reduce this summary to five questions: 1) How do we decide where each of the five discourses begins? 2) Does not a circular argument develop between redaction-critical work on a particular discourse and redaction-critical hypotheses for the Gospel as a whole? 3) Is the discourse to be treated as discursive or thematic? 4) What evidence is there regarding the level of interpretation appropriate to picture language? 5) Are not the criteria employed by scholars in differentiating between tradition and redaction too variable for any satisfactory progress in the area? Regarding 4) the use of the σκανδαλ-root in Mt 18 offers a possible approach to this question. In biblical and intertestamental contexts σκανδαλίζω can refer to a wide range of contexts: (a) blasphemy against God, against the Spirit, or idolatrous acts of speech; (b) moral offences against humanity, against the law of God, especially those caused by money or women; (c) community offences due to lack of consideration, especially in the relation of strong and weak, Jews and Gentiles; (d) doctrinal offences, due to teachers who mislead, due to deception or to anti-Christians, leading to apostasy, or even 'heresy'; (e) apocalyptic events such as idolatry, immorality and false prophecy; (f) rejection of Christ, such as the cursing of Jesus or his cross, perhaps under the pressure of a pagan court. When this range of uses is presented in the form of a conspectus of the passages concerned, it becomes clear that important clusters of associations had been forming, both conceptual and topical, including items found in the vocabulary of ch. 18—topics such as wastrels, thoughtless members of the community, and those who tempt the faithful to idolatry or to lawlessness. In its failure to be specific 18:7ab opens up possible reference points between σκάνδαλα and the rest of ch. 18 (e.g. in relation to μικροί, χείρ, πούς, ὀφθαλμός, πλανάω, ἔλεγξον). The inevitability of σκάνδαλα and their practical importance are thus brought together. To judge by this one example an answer to 4) above would be that too narrow a definition of reference points for the picture language in ch. 18 would be unwise.

Matthew's compositional techniques with reference to a Special Matthean Source; others prefer to speak of a reworking of Mark or of a special version of Q.

The general shape of the chapter is clear: Matthew 18 divides itself into two balancing sections (18:1-14; 18:15-35), each ending with a parable. The first part begins with Marcan parallels (Mt 18:1-5; Mk 9:36-37, 10:15) and ends with the parable of *The Sheep*. The remainder of the chapter has material in an order similar to Luke 17:1-4 and concludes with the parable of *The Unforgiving Servant*. Matthew 18:15 therefore marks the turning-point of the chapter. The verse is structurally significant as the opening of the second section, introducing the subject of how sinful acts are to be disciplined; and it is source-critically important because of its parallel in Luke 17:3. Matthew 18:15 and Luke 17:3 are very similar in outline; they both include a conditional clause and an imperatival apodosis. But they differ in vocabulary and syntax. For an appreciation of the way in which Matthew 18 was assembled, those differences of vocabulary and syntax are important. If the vocabulary and syntax of Mt 18:15 are Matthean, then there would be good reason to believe that the author of the Gospel was responsible for the shaping of the whole chapter; if they are not, then other explanations might be possible or even preferable. If the vocabulary and syntax are not Matthean, much depends on how the issue of 'consistency' is to be resolved. As we have said, consistency of milieu, diction and method is a difficult test to apply, and there are inevitably subjective elements built into its use. The assessment of stylistic factors is not immune from subjectivity, and a great deal depends on what range of vocabulary and syntax can be considered likely as part of a particular writer's style. But if the differentials of vocabulary and syntax between Mt 18:15 and Lk 17:3 are not Matthean, we have to decide how to evaluate a number of possibilities. One of those possibilities is the possibility of a pre-Matthean form of the material. In the case of 18:15 there is also a formal link with 18:16-17; so, associated with a decision on 18:15 is the question of the origin of 18:16-17. 18:21 is similar to Lk 17:4, with a parallel in order between 18:15,21 and Lk 17:3,4; and separating 18:17 and 18:21 are sayings found only in Matthew. So a decision regarding 18:15 is crucial for understanding not only how the whole chapter was assembled but also how unit 18:15-20 came into being. The linguistic evidence regarding 18:15 is complex. The syntax may well be non-Matthean,[19] and the phrase

---

[19] For the evidence of non-Matthean Greek syntax, see the use of ὕπαγε: ὑπάγω: Schenk, *Sprache*, 449; Neirynck, *Vocabulary*, 327; Bergemann, *Prüfstand*, 127-128.

Mt 19x:

Mt 4:10	Diff Lk	Lk >*	Mt ὕπαγε Σατανᾶ...

The textual tradition is influenced by 16:23, on which

		see below.
5:24	No Par	Mt ὕπαγε πρῶτον διαλλάγηθι... καὶ τότε ἐλθὼν πρόσφερε... i.e. WITH IMPERATIVE, an Anarthrous Imperative in v24b.
5:41	No Par or Diff Lk	Mt ὕπαγε μετ' αὐτοῦ...
8:4	Par Mk	Mt ὕπαγε σεαυτὸν δεῖξον...καὶ προσένεγκον See on Mk 1:44 below; i.e. WITH IMPERATIVE, an Anarthrous Imperative in Mk and Mt. Lk > ὕπαγε.
8:13	Diff Lk	Mt ὕπαγε ὡς ἐπίστευσας... Lk >
8:32	Diff Mk	Mt ὑπάγετε Mk and Lk καὶ ἐπέτρεψεν αὐτοῖς... See Schürmann, *Reminiszenzen*, 116 [see Mk 5:19].
9:6	Par Mk	Mk and Mt ὕπαγε, alongside ἔγειρε ἆρον... Lk > πορεύου, alongside ἔγειρε καὶ ἆρας...
13:44	No Par	Mt ὑπάγει καὶ πωλεῖ... i.e. WITH INDICATIVE, two Indicatives linked by καὶ.
16:23	Par Mk	Mt ὕπαγε ὀπίσω μου Σατανᾶ... Lk > (Luke does not have the section).
18:15	Diff Lk	Lk >* Mt ὕπαγε ἔλεγξον αὐτὸν... i.e. WITH IMPERATIVE, an Anarthrous Imperative, except in the Western text tradition.
19:21	Par Mk	Mt ὕπαγε πώλησόν σου τα ὑπάρχοντα... Mk ὕπαγε ὅσα ἔχεις πώλησόν. Mt and Mk with order variations both have ὕπαγε i.e. WITH IMPERATIVE.
20:4	No Par	Mt ὑπάγετε καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰς...
20:7	No Par	Mt ὑπάγετε καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰς...
20:14	No Par	Mt ἆρον τὸ σὸν καὶ ὕπαγε... Schenk, *Sprache*, 450, is misleading here.
21:28	No Par	Mt ὕπαγε σήμερον ἐργάζου... i.e. WITH IMPERATIVE. The anarthrous reading is textually secure.
26:18	Par Mk	Mt and Mk ὑπάγετε εἰς...καὶ εἴπατε. See Mk 4:14 and Senior, *Passion*, 56 n.3. Mk has ἀπαντήσει. Lk συναντήσει > ὑπάγετε.
26:24	Par Mk	Mt & Mk ὑπάγει. Lk 22.22 πορεύεται.
27:65	No Par	Mt ὑπάγετε ἀσφαλίσασθε... i.e. WITH IMPERATIVE. On v65 and GPet 8:30, see Brown, *Death*, 1294-1295.
28:10	No Par	Mt ὑπάγετε ἀπαγγείλατε... i.e. WITH IMPERATIVE, an Anarthrous Imperative. Contrast the constructions in the longer ending of Mark (Mk 16:9-20).
Mk 16x		
1:44	Par Mt	As in the case of Mt 8:4 above, i.e. WITH IMPERATIVE, an anarthrous use (see Black, *Aramaic* (1953²), 46).
2:9		TEXT ὕπαγε $\mathfrak{P}^{88}$ ℵ L Δ 892 bo?; also see D v11. At Mt 9:5 there is no comparable reading.
2:11	Par Mt	See Mt 9:6.
5:19	>	See Mt 8:32 above. Lk 8:39 ὑπόστρεφε.
5:34	>	Mt > ; Lk 8:48 πορεύου.
6:31	>	TEXT υπαγωμεν D it (sy^{s,p}); Lk >*.
6:33	>(*)	Mt >

ὕπαγε ἔλεγξον αὐτὸν μεταξὺ[20] σοῦ καὶ αὐτοῦ μόνου is as a whole a step beyond LXX Greek and in a direction away from Semitic usage. The role of

---

6:38	>	Mk ὑπάγετε ἴδετε... Lk > i.e. WITH IMPERATIVE.
7:29	>*	On Mt 15:28, see Schenk, *Sprache*, 450.
8:33	Par Mt	See Mt 16:23 above.
10:21	Par Mt	See Mt 19:21 above.
10:52	>*	Mk ὕπαγε... Lk 18:42 ἀνάβλεψον...
11:2	Diff Mt	Mk and Lk ὑπάγετε. Mt 21:2 πορεύεσθε.
14:13	Par Mt	See Mt 26:18 above.
14:21	Par Mt	See Mt 26:24 above.
16:7	Diff Mt	Mk ὑπάγετε εἴπατε... i.e. WITH IMPERATIVE. Mt πορευθεῖσαι εἴπατε (no textual variants). Lk >.

Lk 5x

8:42	Diff Mk	Mt and Mk ἠκολούθει. Schürmann, *Reminiszenzen*, 113, on Mk 5:34.
10:3	Diff Mt	Mt >* Lk ὑπάγετε. Mt and Lk ἰδοὺ...ἀποστέλλω.
12:58	Diff Mt	Mt >* Lk ὑπάγεις. Mt 5:25 εἶ μετ' αὐτοῦ... Schenk, *Sprache*, 450, refers to Mt 5:24.
17:14	No Par	
19:30	Par Mk	See Mk 11:2 Diff Mt 21:2 above.

Pryke, *Redactional Style*, 140, treats the Anarthrous Imperative with ὕπαγε as Marcan Redaction. Mk 11:2 and 16:7, both Diff Mt, suggest that the construction is not Matthean Redaction. Schenk, *Sprache*, 450, treats Mt 4:10 and 8:32 as the only examples of a negative emphasis and therefore regards both as redactional. See however Mk 8:33=Mt 16:23. Jeremias, *Sprache*, 184, argues that in view of the 11 examples where Luke avoids the Marcan uses of ὑπάγω, the Lucan uses are traditional, including Lk 10:3 Diff Mt. Mt 10:16 >* (see Lk 10:3 above) might also be a significant Matthean omission. Bergemann, *Prüfstand*, 128, examines the alternatives to ὑπάγω which appear in the synoptic tradition and concludes: 'Vorstehende Analyse zeigt überaus deutlich, daß Lk ein gestörtes Verhältnis zu ὑπάγω zu haben scheint: Er eliminiert oder ersetzt es in zahllosen Fällen, so daß eine einzelne sekundäre Einfügung (8,42) dieses Ergebnis nicht beeinträchtigen kann. Andererseits läßt sich aber auch nirgends beobachten, daß Mt von sich aus dieses Verb in seine Vorlage einträgt; vielmehr übernimmt er es bis auf eine Ausnahme (21,2) regelmäßig aus Mk.' It is then likely on three grounds that ὕπαγε in Mt 18:15 is traditional: that the Verb is not Matthean editorial; that the anarthrous use of the Imperative is not Matthean editorial; and that the alternatives to ὑπάγω belong to a group of interlocking formulae.

[20] μεταξὺ may be a significant usage. In the sense of 'between' it is used as a single Preposition in Mt 18:15, 23:35 Par Lk; Lk 11:51 Par Mt (Jeremias, *Sprache*, 210); Lk 16:26 No Par and Acts 15:9. However, it is always repeated in the LXX (see Gen 31:50; Judg 5:27; 3 Kgs 15:6,32), in Aquila (except at 1 Kgs 20:3), and in Symmachus (except at Ex 8:16). M'Neile, *Matthew*, 266, regards the use of a single Preposition here as Semitic: 'The Aramaic idiom is followed in μεταξὺ σοῦ καὶ αὐτοῦ which Syr vet uses for κατ' ἰδίαν in 17:19; 20:17; Mk 9:28.' But in fact the Syriac idiom involves two Prepositions and not one [Mt 18:15 ܒܝܢ ܗܘ ܥܡ]; and the Aramaic of the Palestinian Talmud also has the double use of the comparable Preposition; see Hag i.7:76c; Kil ix.4:32b; Pes iv.9:31b.

ἔλεγξον is not clear and its translation depends on several factors: does it mark an infringement of an established code of practice ('rebuke') or an informal action ('take the matter up with'), or something in between, depending on what kind of authority is involved ('reprove')? Above all, how far does its translation depend on the function of 18:15 in relation to 18:16-20, especially v18?[21]

---

[21] Thompson, *Divided Community*, 178 n.9, suggests a range of possible meanings for ἐλέγχω, gravitating around 'uncover, expose'. But the range offered there is incomplete and probably in part irrelevant. There is a longer and a shorter reading in 18:15. If, as is probable, the shorter is original, the sins in question may be sins against other people (Pesch, *Seelsorger*, 37 n.1; Lagrange, *Matthieu*, 353; Thompson, *Divided Community*, 176 n.1). One context for understanding ἐλέγχω is the Jewish interpretative tradition based on Leviticus 19:17f. Three points in that tradition are significant: 1) 1QS 5:26–6:1 (and CD 9:2-8); personal reproof is to be followed by reproof before witnesses and if necessary before the community in the light of the Day of Judgment. The discussion of these passages in Davies, *Sermon*, 221-227, depends on Millar Burrows's translation, which obscures an important factor in the community context for the exposition of Leviticus: the role of murmured censure and grumbling dispositions in a community (see בחלונה in 1QS 5:26 and בעורף in 5:27; Leaney, *Rule*, 127, Dupont-Sommer, *Qumran*, 149 n.1: also לבבו; Wernberg-Møller, *Manual*, 29, and Mt 18:35; and the ambiguity of ישא as a reason for further exposition: see CD 9:2ff). The Qumran material by no means exhausts all the community factors in the constructing of this tradition: see Schüssler-Fiorenza, *Judging*, 1-8; Künzel, *Studien*, 201f, especially in relation to 1 Cor 5 and Ephesians 4:26; 2) Ecclesiasticus 20:1-6 deals with the dangers and limits of reproof, especially when accompanied by anger and violence; 3) Test Gad 6 develops three aspects of Leviticus: motivation for reproof, embarrassment in reproof and leaving judgment to God.

What is the relation of ἐλέγχω in 18:15 to 18:18 and the use of λύω and δέω there? It could be argued that ἐλέγχω in 18:15 is a purely personal rebuke, whereas 18:18 refers to a corporate responsibility. 18:18 has the parallel in 16:19, and could be prior to, dependent on, or complementary to 16:19. That they are complementary seems the more likely in view of the difficulties in explaining on the former hypotheses why both 16:19 and 18:18 are included in Matthew and why 16:19 concentrates on Peter and 18:18 on the larger group (pace Catchpole, *Q*, 137). If they are complementary, we may take the context in ch.18 as favouring 'forgive', 'withhold forgiveness' (see Jn 20:23), and that of ch.16 as possibly including 'permission or prohibition of particular behaviour'. (See p.216 n.140.) The evidence for 18:18 meaning 'forgive, withhold forgiveness' is strong, especially in the somewhat strengthened sense offered by Basser of 'loosing the bonds of death' in the case of those in good standing or 'tightening the bonds of death' in the case of those excluded (Basser, *Binding*, 300; in response to Derrett, *Binding*, 112-117; see also Hiers, *Binding*, 233-250, who distinguishes a possible earlier use of 'binding' for exorcisms from the later Matthean use for determining ultimate destiny; on the problems involved in the phrase 'ultimate destiny', see Falk, *Binding*, 92-100, Gnilka, *Kirche*, 56, and the discussion of Mt 25:31-45). Whether this activity of 'binding' and

The evidence regarding 18:16-20 is more complicated still. The linguistic evidence suggests at several points Semitic syntax,[22] and it appears that 18:15-17 belongs within a long tradition of interpretation based on Lev 19:17-19. The tradition represented in Mt 18:15-17 is to be found in Wisdom literature, in the Qumran material and in other intertestamental material. It is out of keeping with what is found in Mt 13:30; and the lack of fit with 13:30 provides further evidence for its traditional character: according to Mt 18:15-17 'sinners', if unrepentant, should be excluded immediately from the 'church'.[23]

The verse which follows, 18:18, is complementary to 16:19. It differs from 16:19 in specific respects and those respects are sometimes said to be redactional. In all probability they are not.[24] 16:9 and 18:18 are said to

---

'loosing' in 18:18 reflects a corporate judgment, or whether it is a monarchical judgment representing the corporate nature of the ἐκκλησία (Brent, *Charisma*, 373), depends on several factors which are discussed in Jones, *Matthew*, 99-103. For the purpose of this note it is sufficient to say that if 18:18 concerned primarily loosing or tightening the bonds of death, the criteria by which such a decision was made, whether it was corporate or individual, would have been clarified in advance of the decision. From that point of view the actions described in ἐλέγχω, λύω and δέω would be closely related. ἐλέγχω, if used here of sins against others and recognized to be an infringement of an established code of practice, would then carry the associations of 'rebuke', rather than the more neutral 'take the matter up with' (REB), or the ambiguous 'reprove' (where the ambiguity lies partly in how personal the authority for the reproof might be).

[22] There is possible evidence of pre-Matthean Semitic syntax in 18:16, 18:19 and 18:20; Beyer deals with several features of 18:15-20 under the category of S1/S2; S1 means 'much more frequent in Semitic languages than in Greek'. Three are listed here:

(a) Beyer, *Syntax*, 100 n.3, classifies Mt 18:16 as S1 (see the full-length repetition of the protasis in 18:16a, as also in 18:17a and 17b following 18:15c. See also Mt 10:13a and 10:13b. It is also important that Beyer in the same note quotes Old Testament parallels: e.g. 1 Sam 12:4-15, where the full-length repetition occurs in both MT and LXX.

(b) Beyer, *Syntax*, 191, places 18:19 among cases where a Relative Pronoun in a conditional relative clause has as its antecedent a Noun preceded by πᾶς, and which are therefore Hebraic or influenced by the LXX.

(c) Beyer, *Syntax*, 196, regards 18:20 as unusual Greek (influenced either by Hebraic or LXX syntax) because ἐκεῖ takes up the Relative Pronoun οὗ in the conditional relative clause.

However in *Syntax*, 229, Beyer also lists more specifically Greek constructions in Mt 18:19 (in category g, 'a Grecism', and in category G1, 'more frequent in Greek than in Semitic languages').

[23] Klein, *Frömmigkeit*. The translation 'congregation' is usually preferred in 18:17; consideration is given to this issue on pp.46-48.

[24] Catchpole, *Q*, 136-137, names three: ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅσα ἐάν, ἐν οὐρανῷ. The first cannot stand alone without other evidence of redactional work, as Neirynck indicates (Delobel, *Logia*, 56-69), and in the light of 18:19a would

belong to a different setting from 18:15-17, and 18:15-17 is said to be a discrete form. In fact the material of 18:15-35 has many facets identifiable as belonging to a family of texts and fits a long tradition of interpretation rather than a discrete form.[25] If, as seems likely, 18:18 is complementary to and not dependent on 16:19, and if it is traditional rather than redactional, it could, as the opening of 18:19a suggests, have been been linked at an early stage with the syntactically distinctive material in 18:19. Presumably the link would have been forged because both concerned a relationship spanning heaven and earth, and perhaps because both began ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν. The syntax of 18:20 suggests that it too is traditional, and the rabbinic ring to its phraseology associates the relationship spanning earth and heaven with the mediation of the divine presence in Jesus Christ. That 18:15-20 is a unit is likely and there is no evidence to show that the unit is a Matthean construction.

The final piece of the puzzle is the parallel between Mt 18:15,21-22 and Lk 17:3-4. Usually it is assumed that the shorter form, the Lucan (Lk 17:3-4), is the earlier and the more extended form, the Matthean (Mt 18:15,21,22) is the later: Matthew took over an outline form and filled it in. That has been challenged[26] on the grounds that the usual approach has not proved productive, and Lk 17:4 does not follow logically after 17:3, whereas Lk 17:4b offers an appropriate sequel to Mt 18:17 and the 'disciplinary form' confirms the possibility that it could be such a sequel. If, as we have suggested, we are dealing in 18:15-17 with a tradition of interpreting Lev 19:17f to which the elements of that text from Leviticus give shape, rather than with a 'disciplinary form' derived from it, then the argument that 18:15-17 is earlier than Lk 17:3-4 is considerably weakened. It is also weakened by the observation that Matthew is involved in ch. 18 in an extension of earlier material: 18:1-14, the first half of the chapter, besides using Q (see Mt 18:6-7/Lk 17:1-2), almost certainly uses a source beyond Q, namely Mark. But once the case for the priority of Mt 18:15-17 is weakened, then the very fact that it could have been argued that the Matthean form was more original, on the grounds that most of 18:15-17 (Catchpole suggests vv15,16a,17) lacks potentially redactional material, becomes important evidence against a purely redactional explanation of the relation of

---

make redactional the only repetition of the formula in successive verses in Matthew; the second ignores the contrary evidence (for the reverse, see Lk 12:3 Diff Mt, and the full details of ὅσος, p.366 n.65); the third ignores the complex pattern of shifts in the synoptic tradition between the Singular and Plural of this Noun, Definite and Indefinite (e.g. Mt 5:12/Lk 6:23; Mt 6:20/Lk 12:33; Mt 7:11/Lk 11:13; Mt 19:21 Diff Mk & Lk; Mt 22:30 Diff Mk; Mt 24:36 Diff Mk; Mk 11:25 Diff Mt; Lk 3:21,22 Diff Mk), some of which are textually uncertain.

[25] See p.223.

[26] Catchpole, *Q*, 135-150.

the Matthean to the Lucan form.[27] Furthermore if, as we have argued, the evidence for redactional work in 18:18 is not strong and vv19-20 contain earlier pre-Matthean material, then the possibility that the whole of 18:15-20 is a pre-Matthean unit has to be given consideration. Such a possibility makes the structural position of v15 in Mt 18 all the more interesting. 18:15 comes after a Q parable which closes the first section of the chapter and introduces a section which also concludes with a parable (18:23-35).

If then the hypothesis of a literary Q developed by a recognizably consistent editing is not, in this case at least, a satisfactory explanation of the Matthean text, we are forced to ask some basic questions about the general method which we are using. Should we pursue the literary solution (Q hypothesis plus consistent editing) in the hope that more detailed work will eventually give a convincing result, because at least the hypothesis of Q can be grounded in the text—although it has to be recognized: 1) that more detailed work on vocabulary and syntax is deepening the problems about the shape of Q; 2) that signs of stratification in Q are extremely fragmentary;[28] and 3) that no clarification has been offered of what is meant by consistency of Matthean editing? Or, alternatively, should we infer from the more detailed work on vocabulary, syntax and form that the literary hypothesis needs to come under scrutiny, that the Q hypothesis needs exposition in terms of levels or strata which cannot be identified by literary methods and needs to be supplemented by a theory of editing which does not rely on the concept of a consistent literary style?

The literary study of Matthew 18 has to be taken one major stage further. The first part of the chapter has parallels with the Gospel of Mark. Mark may be regarded as a source for Mt 18, and linked with the Marcan parallels is the question of the chapter's structure. The opening verse, 18:1, is parallel to Mk 9:33 and could suggest that Matthew composed a narrative framework (17:22-23, 17:24-27) within which 18:1 provided a Marcan opening for the new discourse.[29] But the arguments deployed for this picture of Matthean redactional work are linguistically and syntactically unreliable,[30] and the relationship of 18:1 to 17:22-27 needs redefinition in the light of that. The opening unit of Matthew 18, 18:1-5, is also based on Mark: 18:2 is parallel to Mk 9:36 and 18:5 is parallel to Mk 9:37, but the

---

[27] See Delobel, *Logia*, and *Semeia 55* on Mk/Q relationships and possible levels of redaction and stratification in Q.

[28] It is possible to gain insights into the history of Q from the synoptic texts (see e.g. Piper, *Wisdom*), but not to write a consecutive history of Q.

[29] Thompson, *Divided Community*.

[30] On the opening phrase of 18:1, see p.13 n.14; on the opening of 17:22, see the Appendix. For a detailed discussion of Thompson's argument, see p.212 n.133 (i), where ἄρα is shown to be a classical use, emphasizing the Interrogative Pronoun, and not, as Thompson claims, logical and illative.

origin of the intervening verses, 18:3 and 18:4, has been much debated. 18:3 contains an unusual phrase, στραφῆτε καὶ γένησθε,[31] which could provide a clarification of Mk 10:15/Lk 18:17; and 18:4 shares with Lk 9:38 the Lucan parallel to Mk 9:38, the summary phrase οὗτός ἐστιν. Furthermore 18:5 also shares with Luke two other points of agreement against its Marcan parallel (the position of δέξηται and the Singular παιδίον with its Singular Adjective). 18:4 is also often claimed as redactional because it is 'a typical example of the Matthean inclusio'; but this is to disregard the fact that the inclusio has a long history in the formation of biblical units, long before Matthew's work,[32] and was

[31] The most likely solution is that 18:3 represents a clarification of the ambiguous phrase in the Marcan parallel, Mk 10:15, although this is not necessarily a Matthean clarification. For the discussion, see Jeremias, *Kindertaufe*, 64; Dupont, *Matthieu 18.3*, 50-60; Jones, *Matthew 18*, 287-292. Dupont's case for a Semitism here is over-generous, overlooks the range of senses possible for στρέφω, and uses incomplete statistics regarding στρέφω (see στραφείς Lk 7:9 Diff Mt and Lk 4x No Par).

[32] Vaganay, *Discours*, 203-244, suggested that behind Mt 18:1-35 and parallels stands a source in Aramaic with a series of word links and ending with a Semitic inclusio. This has advantages: it suggests how particular logia have developed, and it explains some connections of thought on the basis of half-suppressed links between key Aramaic words (see Vaganay, *Problème*). But the difficulties outweigh the advantages, notably the apparent literary unit of Mk 9:33-50, whose links seem explicable in terms of its Greek text and without recourse to an Aramaic basis, whereas Mt 18:1-4 and Lk 9:46-50 appear to throw little light on the pre-history of Mark 9 (see Neirynck, *Tradition*, 33ff). The evidence of a Semitic inclusio needs careful definition. Inclusio is defined by Fenton, *Inclusio*, as 'repetition at the end of a paragraph of words from the beginning of the paragraph'. A sharper definition is provided by Bauer, *Structure*, 18, based on Soulen, Dewey and Muilenburg: 'Inclusion involves the repetition of features, words, phrases and so on at the beginning and the ending of a unit, thus having a "bracket" function.' The examples which Fenton offers are, using Vaganay's list:

6:19-20 The only word found in both v19 and v21 is θησαυρός. Vv18 and 19 involve repetition in consecutive verses. On repetition as a stabilizing element within oral tradition, see Wrege, *Überlieferung*, 110. Lk 12:33-34 is a close parallel to Mt 6:19-20 but lacks the Matthean repetitive form. 6:19-20 does not match exactly either of the definitions of inclusio.

7:16-20 The whole sentence in 7:16 is repeated in 7:20 with ἄρα γε added. It is the classic inclusio. However, the duplicate in Mt 12:33c=Lk 6:44 is a conclusio in both Gospels, not an inclusio. Why is it to be assumed that in the former case the addition is Matthean, when this is the only example of an inclusio marked by ἄρα γε?

9:14-15 νηστεύσουσιν appears in the same position in all three Gospels. It could be argued that in Matthew it occurs as the last word, whereas in Mark and Luke it is followed by a prepositional phrase. However this cannot be used to make a case for treating the repetition of the Verb in Matthew as an inclusio,

since Matthew delays the opening use of that Verb to a later position than in Mark and Luke. In any case the final Verb in all three Gospels expresses only a partial answer to the opening question in Mt 9:14b and parallels. Does 9:14-15 constitute either a 'paragraph' or a 'unit'?

12:2-8 The apothegmatic structure appears in all three Gospels and involves no clear repetition. In Matthew only the Particle γάρ and the Singular σαββάτῳ suggests any distinctiveness of the Matthean text over against the other two, and in view of Mt 12:5 this cannot be said to constitute a case for a Matthean inclusio.

12:39-45 Mt 12:45 has no parallel in Luke and picks up two words found in 12:39. But in that case why does not Fenton also classify 16:1-4 as an inclusio? Is Mt 12:45 actually an inclusio? Or is it properly a conclusio?

15:2-20 Mt 15:20b has no parallel in Luke and hints at two words in 15:2. In this way the Matthean section resumes the issue of the purification of hands, whereas the Marcan does not. Again is it a conclusio, a rounding off of the argument, rather than an inclusio 'bracket'?

16:6-12 This is an unusual case since v6 is repeated almost exactly in v11 (Diff Mk) and v12 uses the same phrase yet again in a subordinate clause. However it is possible that the section is traditional (see Jones, *Matthew*, 17-19; Baumbach, *Sadducees*, 173).

18:1-4 The question given is answered precisely in v4. However, Luke has also added to the Marcan material the main construction to be found in Mt 18:4.

18:10-14 Mt 18:10 and 18:14 both include the phrase 'one of these little ones'. But if the notion of a 'bracket' is primary why is 18:10 selected rather than 18:6, which has the same phrase? Perhaps it is that an original inclusio in 18:10-14 has been given a wider reference through the use of the tradition in Mt 18:6 Par Mk 9:42. v14 is thus a summary of 18:6-14, or a conclusion of 18:1-14. This extended use of a repeated phrase indicates the ambiguities in the Fenton/Bauer definitions.

19:3-9 The question regarding divorce includes the phrase κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν, and the answer (19:9) includes the phrase μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ. But if, as some argue, the additions may be pre-Matthean (see van Tilborg, *The Jewish Leaders*, 122), the correspondence of question and answer may also be pre-Matthean (see however Holmes, *Divorce*, 651-664).

19:30–20:16 It must be noted that this example, which is often regarded as a classic example of an inclusio, does not correspond to the definitions of inclusio given above. A verse has been repeated at the end of two consecutive paragraphs.

21:3-7 An opening question is met by a concluding statement. By the definitions given it is an inclusio. It appears in all three Gospels.

21:33-41 The argument here concerns ἐξέδοτο αὐτὸν γεωργοῖς Mt 21:34. But 21:42-43 also is an integral part of the interpretation of the parable, so the phrase in 21:34 is a repetition of an earlier conclusio to the parable. Mark and Luke also include this kind of repetition. If we term this an inclusio, what does inclusio mean beyond 'repetition'?

22:43-45 A more exact repetition of the wording of the question when the answer is given is to be found in Lk 20:41-44. Lk 20:44 corresponds closely to Mt 22:45 and both differ from Mark. It is one of the Minor Agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark. An interesting comment is that the use of

possibly also part of clarifying processes at work in the post-literary phase of Mark's history.

A decision as to how Mt 18:1-5 was formed is therefore difficult to make. Some would say that the reason for the difficulty lies in the hypothesis of Marcan priority. They would argue that if you begin with Mt 18:1ff and work from there toward the Marcan and Lucan forms, many of the aforementioned difficulties disappear. W.R. Farmer, for example, suggests that Mark was using Luke and Matthew, that Mark incorporated the material found in Mt 18:1-5 in the process of copying Lk 9:46-48, and then followed the series of sayings in Mt 18:6-9, conflating Matthew and Luke in the process.[33] Mark's secondary character, he argues, can be seen in Mark's pedantic threefold admonition, in his gloss on Gehenna, and in his substituting of 'to enter the Kingdom of God' for Matthew's 'to enter life'; Mk 9:49 is a gloss on the previous Marcan material and Mk 9:50 has either been added from memory or was added as the result of careful conflation. Since, he continues, Mark could not combine the different forms of the *Lost Sheep* parables, he omitted the parable—his normal practice in such cases. This left Mark with the problem of the remaining material in Lk 15. He resolved this by moving forward to a passage in Matthew which has the parallel to Luke's central section (Mk 10:1-12; Mt 19:1-12; Lk 16:18).

Such an alternative hypothesis for the synoptic relationships associated with Mt 18:1ff cannot be said to be simple. It is in fact so complex that,

---

question and answer in 22:43-45 and 18:1-4 involves in both an agreement with Luke against Mark. Is this part of a clarifying process?

To Vaganay's list Fenton adds his own suggestions:

1:1-17 Fenton must be considering here the repetition of the names of Christ, Abraham and David. But v17 includes not only these but a fourth element also, 'the Babylonian exile'.

5:3-10 This is an example of repetition. If however it is an inclusio, why is not 5:11-12 included in the category also—an inclusio Diff Lk? Perhaps the answer is that it does not attract attention to itself functionally. That is to say, Fenton and Bauer have not made explicit in their definitions all the factors which are controlling their analysis.

An interesting example of where Mark has an inclusio and where Matthew omits the final feature which creates the inclusio is Mk 12:27 >*Mt. We conclude that Fenton's definition is ambiguous in its use of 'paragraph' and may not have made explicit all the controlling factors of his analysis; he is unwise to say that 'Matthew enjoyed making use of these methods of arrangement, and, on occasion, consciously contrived them'. The definition of Bauer fares little better. Much of the evidence is of a mnemonic or clarificatory character, particularly in the framing of material in terms of question and answer. We also conclude that Vaganay is unwise to use the term inclusio of 18:1-4 as an argument for a Semitic source and that Abbot Butler's parallel argument, *Originality*, 150ff, for the priority of Matthew is similarly misleading.

[33] Farmer, *Problem*, 253.

like many similar hypotheses, it is vulnerable to the criticism of being incomplete. It does not, for example, explain why Mark, following Mt 18:6-9, omits Mt 18:7; it does not say why Mark chooses expressions such as τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον when the only other use of that expression occurs in a passage which Mark omits (Mt 3:12; Lk 3:17); it does not say why the Marcan vocabulary is reasonably self-consistent in Mk 9:33-37 when Mark is following Luke (Lk 9:46-48), yet lacking in self-consistency in Mk 9:42-48 when Mark is following Matthew (or indeed why it is semi-consistent in 9:38-41 when Mark is following Lk 9:49-50). So the fault need not lie in the hypothesis of Marcan priority. There are problems in tracing editorial procedures in the material associated with Mt 18:1ff whichever basic theory of synoptic relationships is assumed.

The main unresolved difficulty in writing a history of 18:1-5 concerns the Minor Agreements between Matthew and Luke in vv4 and 5. Should they be regarded as accidental agreements? Or do they point to a pre-Marcan form of the Gospel or a post-Marcan form? Part of the argument of the present book is that lists of the Minor Agreements are incomplete, and that agreements in form as well as the agreements in vocabulary should be added to the lists. The longer the lists the more difficult it becomes to argue that these are accidental, and agreements in form are harder to explain away than agreements in vocabulary. Another part of the argument is that Matthew and Luke are working with a strongly homogenized tradition. Parabolic research yields some interesting examples of such agreements and they strengthen the case for treating the Minor Agreements as significant for the history of tradition.

Returning to the case of 18:4b, the agreement between Mt 18:4b and Lk 9:48b makes excellent sense as a clarification of the less consecutive Marcan text. In the case of 18:3 it would certainly be unwise to trace that verse to a version of the Marcan Gospel earlier than our canonical Mark, on the grounds that the Marcan text might be directly dependent on an Aramaic original. Mk 9:33-50 is one of the longest of the Marcan discourses and one which in its present form owes its coherence as a discourse to specifically Greek word-play. So if there is a hint of a non-canonical tradition of Mark to which Matthew and Luke both had access, the evidence should not be taken as pointing to an original Mark (an 'Ur-Markus'). The evidence here is, if anything, slightly in favour of a post-canonical Marcan tradition, perhaps an orally transmitted form of Mark rather than a Mark II of the kind which Fuchs and Aichinger suggest.[34] If that is the case Matthew would be

[34] See Neirynck, *Duality*, *Minor Agreements* and *Logia*, 769-779; Ennulat, *Minor Agreements*. Fuchs, *Untersuchungen, Behandlung, Überschneidungen* and *Entwicklung*, with Aichinger, *Ährenraufen* and *Epileptiker*, show the strength of the case for a post-Marcan phase of the tradition but fail to show that this

using a form of Mark different from our canonical Mark, and would have been rehearsing that form of Mark with some accuracy. Those two possibilities affect any assessment of the final editor's contribution to Matthew's Gospel. They suggest that we cannot always judge the editor's work by reference to the differences between our canonical Matthew and our canonical Mark; they suggest that the editor's work could be more limited than has often been assumed; and they show that the editor might be recording tradition with some accuracy.

We have been using Mt 18 as an illustration of how difficult it is to identify Matthew's compositional method on the basis of source-critical assumptions. Even given the priority of Mark, the form of the tradition which Matthew used cannot easily be defined. Even assuming the hypothesis of Q, the form of Q which the writer had to hand is similarly problematic. In Part Two, which will involve a study of the outline of each of the five main sayings-collections, we shall find the same situation in each. As far as both Mark and Q are concerned it appears likely that Matthew was using source material which was still being shaped by the processes of tradition, so that we are hardly ever in a position to make clear-cut judgments about the form in which Matthew received the sources, or to argue, as the pioneers of redaction criticism did, from precise sources to Matthean redactional contributions. In every case we have to recall the possibility that the final redactor may be heir to a long development within the tradition.

Because of the refinements in linguistic and syntactical study there are problems also now in the definition of the Special Matthean material. Often the distinction between the claim that a passage belongs to a Special Matthean Source and the counterclaim that it is redactional rests on tiny fragments of evidence. Matthew 25:31-46 has received several major treatments recently and two of the monographs on that parable reveal the narrow linguistic base on which judgments are made. Even when compositional factors are introduced into the discussion the total evidence is too small for satisfactory conclusions to be drawn. In his treatment of Mt 25:31-46 Friedrich[35] attempts to separate source material from redaction by regarding the stylistic data as crucial, and by setting down three basic rules for their use: that words must be divided up among the various sources and

---

necessarily belongs to a Mark II stage when the Q material was also introduced. Goulder, *Luke*, suggests a simpler solution, that Luke knew Mark and Matthew; but this proves to be more complex as the argument progresses (see Downing, *Paradigm Perplex*; and Brown, *Death*, 42-46, who argues, against Neirynck, that in the discussion of the positive Minor Agreements the factor of orality cannot be excluded).

[35] Friedrich, *Gott im Bruder*; also *Wortstatistik*, 30.

only where the redactor has altered the source can editorial work be regarded as provable; that judgments need to be made on each word on a sliding scale from 'editorial likely' to 'editorial unlikely'; and that authorial preference needs defining, for example in relation to the availability of synonymous alternatives. Friedrich associates with this linguistic data the evidence adduced from discussion of the composition and contents of Special Matthean material. He quotes Schweizer's four grounds for regarding Mt 13:24-30, 18:23-35, 22:1-14 and 25:1-13 as belonging to a prior oral tradition, and he applies them to a further group including 13:36-43, 13:47f, 13:49f and 25:31-46. The four grounds are: 1) identical introductory phrases; 2) extended narrative form; 3) evidence of clear intention in the position given them by the editor; 4) a shared theme, such as the rejection of those called, who at the final judgment will be unmasked and punished. By means of the conjunction of stylistic and compositional features Friedrich argues that it is possible to identify with some confidence the Special Matthean Source and its use by the redactor.

Friedrich's method is vulnerable at many points. He treats the stylistic data as hard evidence of source usage rather than as part of the map of synoptic territory, although his suggestion of a sliding scale to indicate degrees of probability and improbability in redactional judgment is a move in the right direction. Brandenburger is also of the opinion that Friedrich's confidence is misplaced. Writing on the same subject, the parable of *The Sheep and the Goats*, Brandenburger[36] believes that Friedrich gives too independent a role within his analysis to two pieces of evidence, both of which Friedrich classes as reliable evidence and both of which Brandenburger rejects. Brandenburger places more weight on the hints given by the redactor regarding his compositional intention. In Part Two there is a detailed discussion of these issues. Relevant to the argument at this point is the extremely small base on which scholars are making their judgments. Just as the refinements in stylistic and syntactical studies have created problems for the understanding of the redactor's use of Mark and Q, so also they have made the isolating of the Special Matthean Source extremely hazardous.

Friedrich's reference to compositional criticism leads into the next stage of literary criticism. One of the early pieces of composition criticism on Matthew's Gospel was that of David Bauer.[37] Bauer refers to the lack of

---

[36] Brandenburger, *Recht*, 17-20.

[37] Bauer, *Structure*, 11-13. Bauer argues for topical structures, basing his outline of Matthew, as most composition critics do, on Kingsbury's 'superscriptions' at 1:1, 4:17 and 16:27. However: 1) the title 'superscription' is misleading since in 4:17 ἀπὸ τότε could be retrospective, referring to Jesus' advancing of the work of John (see Murphy-O'Connor, *Structure*, 366, contra Prabhu, *Quotations*, 120ff), and not prospective only, as Kingsbury argues; see

consensus among scholars regarding the structure of Matthew's Gospel and ascribes this to an interest in the process of redaction rather than in the final product, and to the variety of emphases in the application of redaction criticism to the text. He recognizes the advances which have been made by redaction critics and wishes to safeguard some of their findings, but is intent on circumventing the disagreements involved in previous work. He believes this can be done by means of a literary-critical study of Matthean structure. The advances made by redaction critics which he values are six in number: 1) an invitation to consider the structural and theological significance of the geographical–chronological references in Matthew; 2) the attempts to relate the five great discourses to the narrative, which Bacon initiated, although according to Bauer 'it is methodologically inappropriate to begin an examination of literary structure with an investigation into Matthew's use of Mark';[38] 3) the Kingsbury division of the Gospel at Mt 4:17 and 16:21; (4) the place of chiastic, numerical and inclusio structures; (5) the existence of discrete topical units[39]—especially in the light of the 'historicization'

Prov 8:22 (Sym), Ps 93:2 (LXX), Isa 16:13 (Theodotion), Eccles 8:12 (possibly), 2 Esd 5:16 and Ex 4:10 (Aquila). ἀπὸ τότε is not always retrospective nor always only prospective (Senior, *Passion*, 50), but can be a 'climactic divider' (Senior, *Passion*, 48 n.2; see 26:16), as in 16:21 (so correctly Frankemölle, *Jahwebund*, 344), possibly even of non-Matthean origin (Schürmann, *Untersuchungen*, 117). 2) Kingsbury depends on an incomplete and inexact reference to Hunkin, 'Pleonastic', 390-402, as well as an incomplete presentation of the synoptic uses of ἄρχομαι. There may well have been a tendency between Mark and the later Gospels to a 'moderate' use of ἄρχομαι (Mk 10:28 Diff Mt 19:27, Lk 18:28; see Mk 10:32; 6:2; 14:71 and parallels), to an adapting of the 'quasi-auxiliary' use (Mk 10:28; 13:5; see also Lk 11:29), and to an interchange of weaker uses of ἄρχομαι in the inchoative Imperfect tense (Mk 15:3; Lk 23:2 and Mk 14:65; Lk 22:63f). 3) The parallel use in Mt 16:21,22 Par Mk 8:31,32 weakens the case for a distinctively Matthean use of ἤρξατο in 16:21. The continuity of the Matthean use of the Marcan tradition at this point suggests a flow which defies the simple divisions which Kingsbury prefers (see Davies, *Matthew*, I 57-72, 289 and 386f). 4) The notion of topical organization of the Matthean material has already been questioned on p.17 n.18; see below, n.39). 5) The relation of Kingsbury's argument concerning 4:17 to the independent units formed by chs. 1-2 and chs. 5-7 is unclear.

[38] Bauer, *Structure*, 35.

[39] 'Topical' requires careful definition. It needs to be defined over against 'thematic' or 'conceptual'. 'Thematic' or 'conceptual' structures may be identified by means of key words (such as μικρός) or a logion (such as Mt 18:14) which operate as the centre for the exposition of a subject. Matthew uses such key words, but in a different way: as an invitation to the reader to make links across the discourse (see p.17 n.18). 'Topical' refers to divisions within the text marked by headings such as 1:1, 4:17, 16:21, which indicate major theological, Christological, eschatological concerns. As we have seen, the description 'headings' is inappropriate for the Matthean material.

debate introduced by Strecker and continued by Trilling, Walker, Frankemölle, Thompson and Meier; and 6) the implications of Matthean structure for Matthean theology. In order to safeguard these advances but make progress on the question of Matthean structure Bauer suggests that the rhetorical features of repetition, contrast, comparison and climax should be given attention. Using these he sets out a possible structure for the whole Gospel, which takes 1:1, 4:17 and 16:21 to be encapsulations of the major themes of the material to follow. These are particularized in comparisons between Jesus and the disciples and in a climax, a final inclusio in 28:18-20, bringing together the themes of authority, universalism and 'God with us'. Within this structure the great discourses underscore that final climax, although ch. 13 provides a pause within the movement of the whole.

This represents a step forward in redaction-critical work, but not of the decisive kind intended by Bauer. The investigations in rhetorical method deserve further attention and in the studies of individual parables and parabolic groupings in Part Two there will be further rhetorical investigations of the kind that Bauer has pioneered. It has however to be said that he has not explored adequately the character of the concluding formulae of the five great discourses,[40] he has not weighed the possibility that a Gospel writer may no more be presenting a personal theological viewpoint than exhausting a personal treasury of language. More important still, Bauer, in castigating the methodological impropriety of beginning with Matthew's use of Mark, jettisons one of the few checks on his imagination. For it is the comparison of Matthew with his source that provides one of the few tests capable of negating his findings. This via negativa is a fundamental resource within redaction criticism. For example, if Bauer is to make a case for inclusio and chiasm as structurally significant for Matthew's Gospel, he must explain why Matthew on occasion avoids them in his sources.[41] It is not sufficient to argue that he uses chiasm (certainly it is insufficient to argue that he uses chiasm without defining chiasm exactly); he must explain why Matthew did not use it when he could have done so. That is not to say that such evidence is finally damning to Bauer's case. There may be a good explanation why on occasion Matthew should avoid that technique. Such an example does however provide evidence which should require Bauer to check his workings. The evidence is not necessarily fatal to his case, because there may be an explanation consistent with the claim that Matthew likes chiastic arrangements. If such an explanation is found, then the via negativa has led to a strengthening of the argument for that claim. But until an explanation is forthcoming the claim is not fully

[40] See p.10 n.7 and p.116.
[41] See p.26 n.31.

substantiated. In the course of this book there will be a number of cases where the via negativa provides disconcerting evidence, opening up inconsistencies between the text and well-known editorial hypotheses; there will be a few cases where entirely satisfactory explanations have been forthcoming, and others where so far there have not. It might be objected that source-critical references are inappropriate to literary criticism. Rhetorical criticism of a modern novel would not usually involve source criticism. But it is precisely because inconsistencies and inconcinnities become apparent in Matthew when the historical factor is taken seriously that the parallel with rhetorical criticism of a modern novel has to be used with caution.

Gospel literary criticism begins with the presupposition drawn from redaction criticism that Matthew's Gospel is a unified whole. The presupposition may be open to question, but the techniques of literary criticism are valuable. They are capable of illuminating many features of the Gospel. That is particularly true of narrative criticism. Narrative criticism has made three distinctive contributions: the study of temporal ordering, of plot and of repetition. Temporal ordering in Matthew incorporates premonitions (the Magi and the Gentile Mission in 28:18-20), foreshadowings (20:29-34 foreshadowing 21:1-9) and references to events beyond the end of the Gospel narrative. These have a particular importance in so far as they include both the narrator and the addressed readers within the same narrative world.[42] Emplotment, when this is understood in terms of narrative flow, causality and conflict analysis, enables the deep levels of meaning within the Gospel to be related to specific conflicts described there, such as those between Jesus and the religious leaders and between Jesus and the disciples.[43] The once-for-all fulfilment of God's plan of salvation is told in relation to the ongoing stories of religious leaders and disciples. Repetition serves many functions, not least for the hearers, who need redundant repetition, verbal repetition, repetition of characterizations through labels and epithets, doubled narratives with variations, and interesting character development to hold their interest, and to help them follow the plot.[44]

These insights into the dynamics of the narrative are helpful. The assumptions hidden within them are less so. There is a widespread assumption that the Gospel is there to communicate an ideology which the reader real or implied should accept. That might of course be the case. It could be that the rhetorical and narrative techniques are instruments of propaganda. There is however an alternative: the Gospel could be

---

[42] Howell, *Inclusive Story*, 110.
[43] Powell, *Plot and Subplots*.
[44] Anderson, *Narrative Web*.

encouraging personal and corporate responsibility in the face of ideological struggles, perhaps ideological struggles within the church, certainly ideological struggles within the Roman Empire. That alternative assumption, if correct, would undercut a great deal of contemporary narrative criticism. There is a further assumption that the conflicts between the characters of the narrative are clearly drawn: 'There is no wise scribe in Matthew who is capable of recognizing the truth when confronted with it.'[45] Such a statement reveals the dangers in narrative criticism. The positive attitude to scribes in Matthew is beyond question.[46] Such an error of judgment does not invalidate the narrative-critical method; it does however suggest that Matthew's approach to the material is more subtle than some interpreters assume. There is also the assumption that narrative includes discourse, whereas a discourse such as the Sermon on the Mount may provide the conceptual criteria by which narrative may be assessed. Another significant assumption is the kind of distinction which can be drawn between the implied reader and the actual reader. By 'implied reader' is meant an embodiment of all the predispositions of the text; by 'actual readers' is meant those who stand outside the world of narrative which the Gospel represents, who can be moved by it, although they may recognize themselves in the negative or inadequate responses in the text. Conceptually the distinction is clear. But what if in practice the narratives are already known to the reader and reflect the reader's own understanding and commitment? Few issues highlight more clearly than this the distinction which is emerging between a literary understanding of the Gospel and an understanding which sees it in terms of the imparting of traditions.

The refinements in redaction and literary criticism have underlined the weaknesses in a primarily literary approach to the Gospel of Matthew. More detailed and more accurate studies of Matthean vocabulary and syntax have shown how difficult it is to establish a consistent picture of the diction of the final editor. Even features which have regularly been claimed as consistent have been undermined by careful definition and the via negativa. Since redaction and narrative criticism arose as a means of explaining the special features of Matthew, the weakening of the literary hypothesis has necessitated an alternative explanation for them. Such an explanation has to posit additional stages between source and redaction, reducing substantially the material attributed to the redactor, increasing the amount of material attributed to tradition and enabling the varieties of expression and emphasis within Matthew to be recognized afresh. It also has to posit a probable care and accuracy in the transmission of the traditions, for otherwise the detailed

[45] Powell, *Narrative Criticism*, 61.
[46] Orton, *Scribe*, 137; Jones, *Matthew*, 8.

Minor Agreements between Luke and Matthew against Mark would not be retained. Compositional and narrative criticism is dependent on the literary approach to Matthew. This and other assumptions made in compositional and narrative criticism have had to be reviewed, although it is important to emphasize that these new skills have enabled the technical means of communication used by the Gospel to be better understood.

We turn next to the problem which these developments pose for the current study of the Gospel genre. The major problem is that these developments threaten the consensus which has been growing over the last ten years. There has been a decisive shift from a sui generis genre for the Gospels to a literary and biographical genre in the pattern of ancient biography. But if the questions which we have raised are justified, then the issues of orality and aurality have to be faced all over again, and the likelihood of ancient patterns of redaction and genre reviewed again, in particular as they relate to the themes and emphases of Matthew. As the purely literary character of Matthew is questioned, the suitability of non-literary alternatives or partly literary alternatives returns to the agenda.

We can begin the review of orality with Bultmann's position. Bultmann argued for a continuity between what had been happening in the earliest stages of the tradition and what occurred in the gathering of the material into its final written form.[47] From the beginning of the synoptic tradition, there had been a gathering, organizing and editing of material which, continuing through oral or written stages, reached its fulfilment in the final composition of the Gospels. That this fulfilment should have resulted in what Bultmann ventured to suggest was an 'eigentlich literarische Gattung', a unique literary genre, had, in his view, to be seen in its continuity with the whole history of the synoptic tradition and as a function of the continuing history of the church's faith and worship. The full difficulty of penetrating through the text to prior traditions and forms became apparent as research proceeded. The fundamental assumption upon which form criticism was built initially was that we have access to the earlier stages of the synoptic tradition through the written text. We know of the oral period, the oral traditions and its forms, or the regularities within their development, and what we know is by courtesy of the final written text of the Gospel. Discussion of the relationship between redaction criticism and form criticism has underlined the consequences of that assumption: first, that access to the oral stages of the church's life through the written Gospels is hazardous; second, that access to the church's life through the written Gospels is bound to be limited, since we know so little of the community context of the Gospel except through the written text; third, that access to

[47] Bultmann, *Geschichte*, 399; *History*, 373-374.

the church's tradition is only via a text which does not differentiate for us between what is tradition and what is redaction; and fourth, access to the forms of the synoptic tradition is only via the written documents, and the latter could well include forms which have emerged in the literary stages of the tradition's development.[48]

Recent developments of form criticism, adapting the work of Bultmann and Dibelius, have sharpened the issues. Theissen[49] accepts Bultmann's emphasis on the unliterary character of the synoptic tradition and Bultmann's distinction between non-literary oral composition, non-literary writing and literary writing. In the case of the Gospels the simple distinction of oral versus literary is not adequate; when the Gospel tradition was written down, variability in the tradition continued through new oral versions which in turn affected later written transmission and caused alterations to the written versions. Oral and written interlocked. Discontinuity, such as the receding of oral modes of narration, and continuity, such as the pervading constraints on narration in a particular genre, both played their part. To this diachronic approach Theissen added a synchronic and a functionalist[50] approach, exposing in a threefold way the influences which affected the narrator, the transmitters and the functioning of the form.

By contrast, Berger,[51] preferring criteria based on the type of communication particular to author and reader, took the literary form of the text ('Form') as a starting-point for form-critical analysis and distinguished sharply between prior oral tradition and the Gattungen, i.e. the forms distinguishable by common formal feature arranged hierarchically and representing in their conventions typical functions within the Early Church. He is interested in an analysis of the history of tradition, but he argues that the latter represents an adapted orality and needs to be examined in appropriate ways, e.g. through the study of word fields. He retains an interest in the existence of an oral tradition; it is simply that the existence of Form and Gattungen in such traditions cannot in his view be demonstrated, and in every example of the tradition available to us consideration has to be given to the way in which the spoken and the written word are dovetailed together. In his view, in contrast to Bultmann and Dibelius, the literary contexts need attention at every level. Every individual text, because of its literary contexts, shares in the features of those contexts. So the individual units have to be considered in increasingly extended horizons. This applies to the Gospel itself. As far as the Gospel is

---

48 Frankemölle, *Evangelist und Gemeinde.*
49 Theissen, *Miracle Stories.*
50 See Horrell, *Social Ethos*, ch. 2.
51 Berger, *Formgeschichte*, 366-372.

concerned, its genre has literary parallels, not least in the biographical and novelistic literature of the contemporary world. In this way the communication model and the literary format become determinative for this new style of form-critical work. Exegesis involves a distinction between convention and those deviations from convention which are necessary for communicating within a particular situation. In that way the relation of the text to prior tradition gains a new and sharper definition.

Later those two Heidelberg developments of classical form criticism will prove significant in the work of defining a 'parable'. For the moment their importance in this discussion of a possible new Gospel genre is that they address the relationship of written tradition to oral tradition. Central to the discussion of oral tradition in Matthew has been a list of features characteristic of orality such as that which Theissen produced: signs of the simultaneity of narrator and listener, narration dominated by the demands of the moment. Anderson has a similar list of specific stylistic features: typical of orality is a formulaic, additive, aggregative and redundant style;[52] and she admits to the view that a modified form of the theory of oral composition is extremely useful for an understanding of the traditions behind the Gospels. Her fundamental interest is nevertheless in repetition and epithets as possessing rhetorical effect. The number of oral techniques which find a natural home in literary texts is also noted by Henaut, but he is doubtful that we can trace the material back into an oral period. Rather he wishes to extend the literary stages of the Jesus material back into the time of Paul and he welcomes Finnegan's evidence for interaction between orality and textuality, especially in the Gospels' literate urban context.[53] This overlapping character of oral and literate styles leads some to regard the distinction between orality and literacy as mythical, and it has to be said that overstatements of the case for orality[54] have on the whole been counterproductive.

Many would agree that the Gospels would have been heard rather than read by the majority of Matthew's contemporaries. Aural reception would have been the most usual, and this would have ensured that oral and rhetorical features of the Gospel would have been experienced as effective forms of communication. The social context within which the Gospels would have been heard could have been any one of three settings: primarily literate, or primarily oral or at the interface between the two.[55] The second of these has provided excellent parallels from professional African storytelling for the

---

[52] Anderson, *Narrative Web*, 219 n.2, quoting Ong, *Orality*.

[53] Henaut, *Oral Tradition*, finds problems with both the Parry–Lord thesis and Finnegan's emphasis on memorization.

[54] Kelber, *Oral*; Halverson, *Oral and Written*.

[55] Goody, *Literacy*, 48-49.

narration of stories in the Gospels[56] and should not be interpreted as betraying any kind of primitiveness of outlook.[57] In the case of Matthew's Gospel a state of literacy must be assumed for some among the audience because of the assumption of acquaintance with Greek translations and traditions of the Old Testament. The shift from oral to written form took different forms because of these various social contexts, and the change had variable consequences. One of these was a change in the status of the tradition, sometimes transforming reflective material into authoritative teaching. But that did not necessarily happen, and it will be important to look at that particular issue later in this chapter.

But perhaps the comment on orality most relevant to Matthew's Gospel is that features of orality present in Matthew relate to the history of the Marcan material. Oral tradition may have affected the Marcan tradition after Mark had been written down. From ancient parallels the repetition of tradition in such a context could be either exact and consonant with the hearers' expectations, or modified to new circumstances and audiences. The citations of Gospel material in the Early Church Fathers provide important evidence on this issue, although interpretations of that evidence diverge significantly.[58] The probable clues to be drawn from those patristic sources are: first, the high level of citation from Gospel material in the period of the Early Fathers; this enables us to see the process within which the material gained authority and it also permits us a glimpse of the freedom with which the material was cited; second, the importance of orality before and after the Gospel material was written down; that raises questions about the motivation, context and purpose for the act of writing down.[59] Was the motivation a situation of emergency? Was the purpose that of providing an aide-mémoire?[60] Or were there other motives? Matthew and Luke both used their sources at least on some occasions with much greater attention to accuracy than the Early Fathers showed. It is not immediately apparent why

---

[56] Vansina, *Oral Tradition.*

[57] Havelock, *The Muse.*

[58] The new edition of Massaux, *Influence of the Gospel*, provides a conspectus of the judgments of Köster, Köhler, Massaux, as well as the evidence from the *Biblia Patristica* (Paris 1975). A key area of debate is whether patristic citations are citations from written Gospels or from Gospel traditions. Köster is prepared to consider that some citations were citations from oral tradition not available to us now; Köhler tends to agree with Massaux that even early citations were of written sources. In the case of 1 Clement there is good reason to argue that the written Gospel of Matthew is cited there (Green, *Matthew, Clement and Luke*).

[59] Roberts, *Codex*; Aune, *Environment*; Achtemeier, *Oral.*

[60] Barton's Hulsean Lectures, Cambridge 1990, gave attention to these questions.

that should have been the case. Were there particular responsibilities in the case of Matthew and Luke which restricted freedom of citation? Were there special circumstances which limited the discretion usually exercised in the course of pastoral writing? If Matthew and Luke were unusual in their accurate use of sources on those occasions, why were they not always so or why were they accurate only then? Or, if they were using oral tradition rather than a written record, were they more often accurate than we realize? The Minor Agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark in Marcan contexts could be evidence of this. While the questions relate to both Matthew and Luke, they apply to Matthew in a special degree since the refinement of linguistic and stylistic study makes it is less easy to identify a final editorial style for Matthew than for Luke. Matthew's method is puzzling. Why should a Gospel writer, in a period during which material was beginning to gain authority, give closer attention to detail than was usual later on in the process when the canon had developed and given a much greater authority to the text? If there were restrictions on editorial freedom so early in the process, what were they and how did they operate? Why should a Gospel writer give such close attention to the exact wording of oral tradition that we discover in the text of Matthew unusual syntactical features, as was evident in the study of Mt 18:15-17? The Gospel writer appears to be operating in a different way from that followed by the Early Fathers. Is it possible to say what was happening?

Excellence of memory could provide one response. The memory of ancient writers and of modern oral poets is well attested.[61] There is no need to invoke the special technical skills for which Jewish scholars were renowned,[62] especially as an insistence on memory skills throughout the entire process of the synoptic tradition would prove more than the texts can justify (how did the variant Last Supper versions arise?). It would also eliminate the oral creativity which alone can explain the speed of developments in the synoptic tradition. The mnemonic aids are present in Matthew which oral declamation has used over many centuries,[63] and the Matthean memory could easily have mastered the relatively small mass of material. But excellence of memory does not explain the difference between Matthew and the Early Fathers. That difference requires an explanation of a less general kind, one that is particular to Matthew's own situation. Perhaps Matthew belonged to a school which specialized in memorizing, or Matthew was expected to be exact by those to whom he owed a responsibility of some kind. The difference between Matthew and the Early Fathers requires a specific not a general explanation.

---

61 Vansina, *Oral Tradition*, 39-47.

62 Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript.*

63 Anderson, *Narrative Web*, 218-225; Carruthers, *Memory.*

The questioning of a mainly literary method in the construction of Matthew's Gospel raises fundamental questions about the current approaches to genre. In the past, three patterns of genre criticism have been considered: Old Testament patterns, non-biblical patterns and the sui generis solution. The Old Testament Chronicler is Goulder's choice.[64] Like the Chronicler, Matthew was providing a liturgical collection with readings suited to a calendar and was using a system of midrashic expansion. Midrash, Goulder suggested, has the duty to edify and to reconcile the old traditions with the new world; for this purpose the midrashist must be creative; he may interpret the appropriateness of biblical parallel as inspiration for his work; and he may be creative in expanding his original. Like the Chronicler, Matthew can omit sections of his original, transcribe others, and include doublets (i.e. two different uses of the same saying or story). His most typical method of expounding Mark is by means of parables. Goulder's is an intriguing paradigm and its value is that it roots our appreciation of Matthean editorial method in ancient biblical times, rescuing it from the modern assumptions which plague some redaction-critical work. Its disadvantage is that Goulder can only claim this on the basis of a parallel creativity in the language used; Matthew's language, vocabulary and style have to support the paradigm. But the detailed studies of the parables show that the paradigm has failed the test.

Frankemölle's suggestion is Deuteronomy.[65] What particularly appeals to Frankemölle is the Deuteronomic insistence on the present, on 'time' as a literary medium. Deuteronomy presents the history of God's people as a means to reflect faith, and that, claims Frankemölle, is what Matthew does. Again there is value in the parallel; it reminds us that Matthew's Gospel is 'historical' in its form.[66] We need, as Bauer says, to define what that 'historical' form would have meant in the first century CE. On that question Ogawa's study of Matthean history is a more exact analysis[67] than either Frankemölle or Bauer provides, and his study of time indications in Matthew's Gospel independently confirms my own.[68] The time indications are informal links without a strong chronological function.

Another virtue of Old Testament parallels is that they illustrate specific constructional features to be found in Matthew, including literary examples of features which have often been claimed to be oral. For example, the Priestly document exhibits a constructional use of the 'echo' technique:

---

[64] Goulder, *Midrash*, ch. 10.

[65] Frankemölle, *Jahwebund*.

[66] Charette, *Recompense*, picks up many of the Deuteronomic themes in Matthew.

[67] Ogawa, *L'histoire*.

[68] See p.13 n.14.

> This...involves the repetition of a key-word, phrase, or clause which has occurred in a previous unit. Sometimes the phrase is planted in the previous unit to prepare an echo which serves to unite various units and suggests a hidden order and plan. The repeated element must be sufficiently imposing to be really experienced by the attentive reader as echoing, as recalling something already heard, something familiar.[69]

Composition techniques available in the time of Matthew are found in the work of historians, both Jewish and Gentile. Examples are found in the conflation work of Josephus and Plutarch. Their work in conflating previous sources appears to have followed the simple pattern of treating one source at a time.[70] Against that background and against the background of Streeter's hypothesis Matthew's method of treating Mark and Q in Matthew 18 appears complex, sometimes moving from one source to the other, sometimes conflating the two. Tatian's pattern appears to have been to maximize the use of traditions, to include as much detail as possible from all the available sources and to minimize the divergences between them,[71] and although that may seem to be true of Matthew (Matthew uses a great deal of Mark, with apparent doublets resulting) it cannot be said that minimizing divergences comes at the top of the Matthean agenda. There are examples where Matthean traditions are brought into a measure of agreement; but Klein's collection of divergences of attitude and spirituality within the Gospel indicates that there are two sides to that argument.

Genre, according to Burridge, has been misunderstood in its use as a category for Gospel research. It requires a literary definition. Genre functions as a kind of contract between author and reader, guiding the interpretation of the text.[72] It is a set of expectations which once recognized helps to place the writing in relation to contemporary literature. So, according to that clarification, a Gospel cannot be sui generis. A work which is sui generis would be lacking in the kind of pre-established harmony which makes communication possible. Burridge's argument is powerful yet not wholly convincing. It is true that no literary plan is sui generis. However, it is possible to imagine an author fulfilling certain expectations by repeating back to an audience material which is already known to them and at the same time arousing new expectations by the way in which that task is executed. In the case of the Gospel of Matthew the Gospel writer could be satisfying his audience by the use of material known to them, in the forms known to them, picked up from previous experience in the teaching and

---

69 Thompson, *Divided Community*, 228.
70 Downing, *Compositional Conventions*.
71 Downing, *Luke, Matthew and Mark*.
72 Burridge, *Gospels*.

worship of the church; but the writer could at the same time be extending those expectations by the context in which the material was placed.

Burridge's survey of Graeco-Roman biographical work has some links with that picture. He finds that biography occurs naturally among groups of people who have formed around a charismatic teacher or leader. The commitment is already there for the biographer to foster and the biography genre would adapt itself to the particulars of the different situations. In the case of Matthew there are distinctive elements. Burridge suggests that the function of the biography genre is to provide teaching or philosophical reflection in a context of polemic or conflict. Given that Matthew's Gospel belongs to a situation of conflict with Jewish leaders, did it also belong to a situation of conflict among Christian groups? In Chapter Three the sociological study of the setting of Matthew will take that issue further. The context of the genre can change, and the use of the genre can change with it. The biography genre, with its opening reference to the subject's name, its frequent use of the Verbs associated with the subject, its size, structure and scale, settings, topics, atmosphere and characterization, may remain identifiably the same, but it may serve new purposes. Alternatively, Burridge argues, different balances in the material, or a larger volume of material, or new attitudes to the characterization might change the literary work to such an extent as to suggest that the boundaries to the biographical genre have been crossed and that consideration of a different genre might be appropriate. Again Graeco-Roman material would provide evidence of the alternative available genres.

How does Matthew's Gospel relate to Burridge's suggestions? That will be the final question to be posed at the end of Chapter Three. But a few initial responses are possible. In the case of Matthew not only might a polemic context be inappropriate from the point of view of the variety of traditions used; the contract which the use of those varied traditions implies could suggest a constructive relationship with the audience rather than one of disagreement. It is also possible that Matthew could be shifting the genre of a Gospel, and not necessarily into a genre known in the outside world. If Matthew has built a contract with his audience, there is no reason why the genre should not reflect that; in Matthew's case a sui generis genre would be a genuine possibility. If Matthew does move away from Mark's pattern, providing a new balance of material, a new type of argumentation, characterization and language, a new relationship between narrative and discourse, it is by no means necessary that consideration of the Matthean genre should be restricted to precedents within contemporary literature. The study of the Matthean parables will provide a study of the shift in the balance of material, especially the shift in the balance between narrative and teaching. The study of the Matthean parables will also provide a fresh

perspective on other changes which have been introduced, the external and internal features relevant to genre research. It might of course be argued that Burridge has already established a sufficient parallelism between Mark and Matthew to confirm the initial suggestion of a common genre for Mark and Matthew, and therefore any changes which have taken place may be understood within the same genre. But his argument rests, as he indicates, firmly on the literary assumptions of redaction-critical method,[73] and this, as we have seen, filters out some important changes of attitude, language and method between Mark and Matthew. The key question to be answered is: has Matthew developed a fresh contract with the audience, involving new forms of argumentation, characterization and authority which take Matthew's Gospel to the edge of ancient biography, in itself a very fluid and flexible concept, and into a new genre, perhaps a genre without parallel?

Because issues of redaction and genre are linked with the context and intention of an author, there have been attempts to identify the themes, the religious ideas and forms and the social dynamics which may have expressed themselves through redaction and genre. Each of these will be illustrated at this stage, since they highlight questions about a new genre model. The full discussion of them must be reserved for Chapter Three.

Two related themes have been explored at depth: the theme of theodicy and the theme of salvation-history. Margaret Davies,[74] in *Studying the Synoptic Gospels* and in her commentary on Matthew, presents the case for Matthew as a theodicy of creation, fall and re-creation. To readers acquainted with Hellenistic biographies of religious leaders Matthew's Gospel might seem familiar enough to be comprehensible, but it would also exhibit some jarring and unexpected details. One of the major differences which the readers would have noted would have been the wealth of parallels with the Old Testament in Matthew, such as the similarities between Joseph's legal father and Joseph the patriarch, the link between sin, disease, famine and disaster, and the belief in angels and demons common to the Book of Matthew and the Book of Tobit. Above all, the eschatology of the Book would have been strange: the resurrection is, she argues, presented in Matthew as the beginning of a new world, offering proof of the efficacy of Jesus' predictions about Final Judgment, promising the transformation of creation, the final justification of the righteous, and a new world order as part of the salvation available to Jew and Gentile. Central to Matthew is that, despite all historical appearances to the contrary, God turns out to be the final victor.

---

[73] Burridge, *Gospels*, 204-205.

[74] Sanders and Davies, *Synoptic Gospels*, 265; Davies, *Matthew*.

The strangeness of the Matthean presentation is worth noting. It reminds the modern reader that however strongly the case might be argued for regarding Matthew as biography, there are some dominant themes additional to that of the person of Jesus Christ which claim the reader's attention, and one of those is the nature, activity and purpose of God, and God's relation to the world and history.[75] But there are difficulties in Davies's presentation. The way in which she articulates those Matthean themes is open to question. She regards παλιγγενεσία as meaning 'new world' (19:28), whereas that vocabulary item has a range of possible senses.[76] Further, the suggestion that the resurrection is a central eschatological motif in Matthew is compromised by the lack of coherence within the Matthean resurrection references.[77] It is not at all clear that the text of Matthew presents a uniform eschatological picture, nor that it was ever Matthew's intention to do so.[78] Nevertheless the Gospel of Matthew is primarily about the nature and work of God and that perspective needs to be upheld.

A different eschatological theme is offered by Kingsbury: Israel's disobedience results in her rejection and in the replacement of Israel by the new people of God, the Christian church. Kingsbury illustrates this theme in his discussion of the Matthean parables in Mt 13. He notes the distinctive form of the Matthean parable of *The Mustard Seed* in Mt 13:31f over against the Marcan and Lucan forms:

> We discover that Matthew has combined the two previous versions but in such a manner that he strikes a neat balance between the desire to underline the element of growth and the desire for a heightened contrast.[79]

---

[75] Osborn, *Emergence*, 75-82.

[76] 19:28 is an isolated use in Matthew of παλιγγενεσία, offering no means of identifying whether or not it is editorial and what its meaning might be in Matthew. It is too ambiguous a term to rest so massive a thesis upon it. Of the 64 recorded uses of the word some belong to the Platonic system of reincarnation or metempsychosis, and others to the Stoic notion of the cosmos's rebirth, others appear to draw on a mixture of systems and ideas about the afterlife, and some suggest a new world order after the eschaton. For a discussion of the term in relation to Pharisaic thought, see Mason, *Pharisees*, 161-170 (and the secondary material cited there); Burnett, *Paliggenesia*, 399f; Sim, παλιγγενεσία, 3-12; Carter, *Households*, 124.

[77] See Derrett, *Palingenesia.* It is difficult to harmonize all the Matthean references to the resurrection and it is unwise to attempt that in view of the discordant character of 27:52-53 and 28:11-15.

[78] Moule, *Function*, challenges the widespread assumption that each of the Synoptic Evangelists is presenting, more or less completely, a personal version of the Christian faith and that of the community which the writer is assumed to be representing.

[79] Kingsbury, *Parables*, 77.

In addition to this balance, says Kingsbury, Matthew has succeeded in bringing together in the treatment of this parable two different kinds of speech: narrative and generalization. The first relates to the action of 'the man', a term which in the proximity of the parable of *The Tares* takes on, suggests Kingsbury, Christological overtones. The verb ἔσπειρεν ('he sowed') refers to the proclamation by Jesus Christ of the Kingdom, a proclamation made initially to the people of Israel in the insignificant circumstances of the life and work of Jesus and of his church. The second part of the parable tells of miraculous growth, pointing to the growth of the church and the Kingdom. This is still, from Matthew's standpoint, a future hope, since the appearance of the Kingdom in majesty and involving the Gentiles still belongs to the future. The distinctive Matthean form of the parable therefore indicates that the opportunity given to the Jews is being forfeited; it is the church that is the eschatological community of God, and the Jews cannot reject the church and at the same time claim to belong to the end-time realm of God. Thus the parable of *The Mustard Seed*, and the parable of *The Leaven* with it, express in the small parabolic unit the essential feature of the larger unit, the import of the chapter of parables as a whole. The Jews received the proclamation; it is the church which responds.

At this point it would be inappropriate to deal with all the issues raised by Kingsbury. Some of them will be dealt with later. But the area of interest here is the Matthean theme which Kingsbury claims to have identified and the way in which the smaller units are linked with the major theme. The distinctive Matthean form of *The Mustard Seed* and the redaction-critical judgments about the whole Gospel have been brought into close association with each other. Even accepting that this means that the imagery of the mustard seed must have a single focus, which is itself a matter open to debate, a weakness in Kingsbury's case is his assumption that the imagery within the parable of *The Leaven* must operate in precisely the same way as in the case of *The Mustard Seed*: it points to the failure of Israel and the response of the church. Yet, whereas *The Mustard Seed* is presented by Matthew in a distinctive form (in Kingsbury's terms it is part narration and part similitude), *The Leaven* (Mt 13:33) is in almost exactly the same form in Matthew as it is in Luke (Lk 13:20-21). Whereas *The Mustard Seed* might be said to have been framed for the specific function of Matthew 13, the same cannot be said of *The Leaven.*

To take the argument a stage further, not only is the parable of *The Leaven* left in an unedited form, the form in which Matthew has left it is widely recognized to be highly evocative. It might of course be argued that once a parable has been placed within a written form as part of a teaching document, it ceases to operate in an evocative way and becomes what is sometimes called 'sedimented' language: that is, it illustrates and instructs

rather than awakening and startling the imagination. But that is a case of petitio principii. That view of Matthean language is not supported by the way in which the aphoristic sayings of Jesus are used in the Gospels,[80] nor by the way in which the Matthean parables are used for preaching, teaching or personal devotion. Even within its literary context *The Leaven* has a potential to evoke new apprehension and awareness of the Kingdom, irrespective of how many times the story has been heard or what might have been the editorial policy of the whole Gospel. That is true of many forms of narrative, oral or written. The Roman poet Horace's version of *The Town Mouse and the Country Mouse* (Satires 2.6.78ff) may be compared with Aesop's fable of the same name.[81] Horace's poem carries subtle cross-currents of opinion and innuendo, with interlocking patterns of vocabulary to indicate those interests, and an alternation of atmospheric writing and hard-hitting polemic. It was, with its humour and sarcasm, intended to be savoured again and again. That degree of sophistication is absent from Aesop's fable, where the narration has a uniform direction and drive. To which of these two, Horace's version or Aesop's fable, are the Matthean parables closest? Some Matthean parables are complex narratives both historically and rhetorically, and have a comparability with the former, albeit a limited one.

A parable is also a kind of fiction which can represent a different view of reality from that of the reader. It can even represent reality to be other than what the author (incorporating the parable ready-made, presumably) would construe it to be.[82] It is by no means necessary that narrative fiction should represent too obviously the narrator's own views.[83] There is often great subtlety involved in a fictional representation. Some scholars appear to assume, like Kingsbury, that every word and phrase in the Gospels must represent the editor's viewpoint. If the author is a spokesperson for the traditions, that is by no means necessarily true; the fictional construction may have been used to represent one voice in a conversation. So behind Kingsbury's attempt to set out a theme for the Gospel there is a questionable hermeneutical theory at work.

Another facet of the discussion about genre is Stanton's suggestion that Matthew is a 'Legitimation Document'.[84] The theory is part of a detailed

---

[80] Piper, *Wisdom*, ch. 2.

[81] Compare with Horace, *Satires* 2.6.78-117, the version of the fable in *Cor Fab Aesop* I. 2. 314 and Babrius, 108.

[82] See Vanhoozer, *Ricoeur*.

[83] See Murdoch's novel *The Sea, the Sea,* where the chief character expounds a view of drama distinct from the novel's author.

[84] Stanton, *Gospel*, 85-107. The approach is called by Stanton 'sociological' but follows the patterns of social historical writing in attempting to establish the function of a written work against a particular historical background.

argument that the Gospel traditions demonstrate an interest in the earthly life of Jesus of Nazareth.[85] A Legitimation Document, such as the Community Document from Qumran may have been, marks the departure of a group from its parent body and provides it with a foundation deed. In the case of Matthew the document sets out the claims of the group: that it is not innovatory (the fulfilment-formula quotations) and that the parting of the ways has divine sanction (Israel has rejected Jesus and God has accepted the Gentiles). Characteristically in such a document there are fierce polemics, with hostile allegations against the parent group. The obverse is the group's internal cohesion without developed internal structures.

There is important supporting evidence for this approach to Matthew: there are six passages in which the evangelist differs from earlier traditions in suggesting a distance between the ἐκκλησία and the συναγωγή (4:23; 9:35; 10:17; 12:9; 13:54; 23:34). Since these are spread across the traditions they represent a significant example of harmonization, suggesting for all the traditions a shared situation. However, the interpretation of this distance between the ἐκκλησία and the συναγωγή is more difficult. There is still no consensus within Matthean studies as to the kind of distance that evidence indicates. Not all are convinced by Stanton's 'Legitimation' theory; in the first place a 'breakaway group' can retain strong, multiple relationships with the parent community over decades and centuries;[86] in the second place it is not clear that the polemic within Matthew is directed at the people of Israel rather than at the leadership of Israel, or at a specific group within that leadership; in the third place the word ἐκκλησία can be understood in many different ways. ἐκκλησία could in itself be understood as pointing to a division dating from a very early period of the Christian movement;[87] it could refer to a single-house community, or as in the case of the Pauline letters either to an individual community or to many such communities understood as ἐκκλησία. In the fourth place, do we have to assume that the Matthean references to 'their synagogues' necessarily had their origin in the current situation? They obviously belong to a period of opposition, but neither they nor the word ἐκκλησία need necessarily refer to a moment of separation. Finally, Stanton's argument from the group's internal cohesion works best on the assumption of a single Christian community. But it is less useful if, as we shall suggest in a moment, the Plural 'synagogues' and the influence of local government patterns point away from a single beleaguered community to a group of such communities standing in different relationships to Judaism.

---

[85] Stanton, *Jesus*.

[86] Saldarini, *Community*, 2.

[87] Schrage, *Ecclesia*, 178-202; Frankemölle, *Jahwebund*, 226-245; Kretzer, *Herrschaft*; Saldarini, *Community*, 116-123.

These attempts to establish a genre for Matthew and how such a genre might have been employed, either in the service of an overall theme, or for a particular purpose or function, have added fresh features to the central concern expressed in this chapter that a literary theory of the origin of Matthew's Gospel may be unsatisfactory. The position of Matthew's Gospel in relation to the development of the Marcan tradition is of crucial importance. The Marcan tradition developed and new non-Marcan material was drawn into the Marcan outline. The structure of Matthew could have changed the function of that outline. So the definition of the Marcan genre does not of itself necessarily determine what the Matthean genre must be; attempts to specify the place of the Matthean Gospel in relation to a biographical genre have not so far met with general approval. Some of the attempts which have been highly influential in recent literary work on Matthew, such as Kingsbury's contributions, are seen to be suspect from the point of view of both method and hermeneutics. There are other theological and sociological issues surrounding the question of genre which need examination: how does the question of the Gospel's genre relate to its theology, and how does it relate to the conflict with Judaism? The need for further work on a genre model for Matthew is apparent.

Before turning to the linguistic material which can throw some light on that issue, there are questions which need to be raised about the social and historical context in which the Matthean traditions may have been collected. If traditions were being gathered together, what was the context in which they were gathered? Was the context a relationship between the Gospel writer and a single community, or between the Gospel writer and several communities? A remarkable number of redactional critics use the Singular,[88] suggesting that the evangelist was writing for one particular church, for example that the writer was part of a Syrian church, was perhaps working in Syrian Antioch. Most scholars assume that the evangelist is in a one-to-one relationship with a Christian church. There are exceptions to this generalization. Theissen writes of Matthean 'communities', and locates the Gospel material[89] in the complementary relationships of wandering and settled groups. The argument so far in this chapter commends more careful attention to that possibility. If there are varied traditions with varied spiritualities, then the possibility of several communities being involved in the process of handing on the tradition is worth investigating.

If we consider the position of Christians in settled urban communities, new factors have to be taken into account. In Rome and Antioch-on-Orontes,[90] indeed in all major cities, local administrative divisions affected

88 For example, Schweizer, *Matthäus*; Kee, *Origins*.
89 Theissen, *Soziologie*, 176-178.
90 Downey, *Antioch*.

the relationships of early Christians, both with their neighbours, whether Christian or not, and with respect to their places of meeting. Trade and travel links brought Jews and Christians into close contact. The particular case of Antioch illustrates what might have happened. Jews and Christians in Apamea-on-Orontes[91] would have come into contact with their counterparts in Antioch, on a more permanent basis than the links which an occasional visitor such as Peter the Apostle could enjoy.[92] Jewish travelling teachers and Jewish city residents would have interacted with each other; Christian travelling preachers and Christian residents likewise.[93] The rural villages would have fostered the usual love–hate relationship between the major city and surrounding hamlets.[94] The tensions between ancient and modern economic structures[95] in town and country and the differences between rural and city traditions would have affected the form of Christian discipleship, making social difference into differences of Christian life-style. In such a network of relationships the Singular 'community' applied to the 'Christian presence' makes poor sense.

This settled pattern of life involved new responsibilities within a local neighbourhood. A personal trade, local community care such as fire services,[96] provision of schooling, hostels for travellers, law enforcement and local administration, or participation in cultural occasions, lectures, visits of rhetoricians,[97] readings of verse,[98] comedies and tragedies, and the rival and more popular attractions of the games, the gladiators, circus acts, mimes, farces—all these might be claims on the attention of a city resident. Different patterns of life led to different timetables even in the ancient world. The poor and the slaves would have to use every daylight hour to earn their living. Different timetables produce different places of meeting. To speak of a single Christian 'community' even within the radius of a city such as Antioch makes little sense. When to this is added, in a city such as Antioch-on-Orontes, the changing pattern of Jewish life and status, the dislocations due to the Jewish War from 66 CE onwards,[99] the comings and goings of Christian missionaries, some with Jewish sympathies, some with Gentile sympathies, the theory of a single Christian community for major cities

---

[91] Wilken, *Antioch*, 71-72; on the strength and vitality of Jewish communities, see Trebilco, *Communities*

[92] Elliott, *Home*.

[93] Theissen, *Soziologie*, 184-191.

[94] Juvenal, *Satires*, 3.

[95] Derrett, *Vineyard*.

[96] Pliny, *Letters*, 10.33.

[97] Pliny, *Letters*, 4.11

[98] Pliny, *Letters*, 9.34; regarding the relation of Roman comedy to the Lucan parables, see Heininger, *Metaphorik*, 63-77.

[99] Price, *Jerusalem*, 144-161.

becomes unlikely. On the other hand there is an important caveat. The size of the Christian community in a city such as Antioch and its public profile should not be exaggerated. Pliny could live as a prominent citizen in Antioch for a considerable period and not know until decades later of the existence of the Christian movement.

In view of these social factors, it would seem entirely proper to consider as a possible context for the gathering of traditions various communities in different relationships with each other. It would of course have been necessary for someone gathering these various traditions to have had access to these different groups, and to have had the opportunity to become thoroughly acquainted with them. If these had clear leadership structures,[100] presumably access to different groups would have been easier for someone without specific status in any one of them.

So far in this chapter we have reviewed the difficulties which a strictly literary explanation of Matthew's Gospel encounters and we have recognized the need for a fresh look at the issue of Matthew's genre. The final stage of this initial chapter is an attempt to place the language of Matthew's Gospel. How does the language of Matthew relate to Mark and Luke? How does it relate to the LXX and the Papyri? What are its main characteristics? Earlier in the chapter the ground rules for language analysis were established,[101] and those rules will be followed here with great care. There is space only for a single illustration, although similar results have been obtained in the case of other constructions. The illustration chosen is the Genitive Absolute, and the reasons for the choice are as follows: many scholars include the Genitive Absolute among the list of clearly redactional constructions;[102] a good deal of comparative material is already to hand, enabling us to see how the Genitive Absolute is distributed across biblical material and non-biblical material;[103] definitions of the construction are clear enough to enable variant factors to be recognized and listed; the elements of the construction provide a rich area of comparison and contrast; and evidence from the textual apparatus regarding the history of the construction in the textual tradition is readily available.

The detailed definitions, analysis, comparative lists and discussion of the construction are found in the Appendix. At this point, only the main results of the study need to be presented. The study of the Genitive Absolute in the Synoptists is a rich and fascinating area. It illustrates the value of taking the categories Mt Par Mk, Mt Diff Mk (etc.) as descriptive of the synoptic relationships. To take these categories as hardened redactional evaluations is

---

100 For a discussion of this issue, see Jones, *Matthew*, 98-103.
101 See pp.11-16.
102 See p.11 and the Appendix.
103 Turner, *Language*, 178-181.

to retreat from the range of the relevant evidence. To recognize them as purely descriptive opens up new possibilities for the explanation of the evidence they offer. Such an approach has of course limitations. It often fails to provide clear answers. On the other hand it is an approach which shows consistently that Matthew's procedure as a writer is as an agent in the formalizing of synoptic language.

The study reveals some dangerous assumptions in traditional redaction-critical assessments of syntax. It is dangerous to assume that the appearance of a particular syntactical form is incompatible with other variants and cannot coexist with them as elements within a single author's style. The LXX material offers invaluable translation material and comparative usages which designate possible spans of congruence. It is dangerous to assume that many examples of a syntactical usage prove each example of that usage to be an author's own personal literary expression. The first of the sequence of usages could have been provided by the material the writer inherited. It is also dangerous to neglect the negative evidence contradicting an otherwise apparently plausible hypothesis. Negative evidence can assist in the refining of that hypothesis or in the setting of that hypothesis within a fresh perspective.

The main finding of the Appendix analysis is that there may have been a formalizing and conserving process at work between Mark and the two later evangelists. The evidence from this single syntactical example points in that direction, suggesting that it is easier to assume the priority of Mark than the priority of Matthew or Luke, and easier to assume a respect for the tradition in the case of both Matthew and Luke than an intention to restate the tradition in terms of a personal style. Moreover the tradition was not static; a process was at work between Mark and the two later evangelists. Hartman identified this process as one of homogenization.[104] His study of Conjunctive Participles, Genitive Absolutes and Periphrastic Conjugations exposed the homogeneity of the Gospels (and Acts) within which tendencies and idiosyncrasies could be identified, in the case of Matthew specifically through formalizing, and in the case of Luke through improving and septuagintalizing. To explain these features, Hartman argued, a period of Greek oral tradition 'in collegia' needed to be posited, in which certain conventions were established which could not be traced in Aramaic or Hebrew, and which gave a relatively solemn stamp to a popular language. This present analysis of the Genitive Absolute extends Hartman's work into the detail of inter-synoptic relationships and gives further weight to his judgment regarding the homogenization of the synoptic material and the establishing of conventions, and also to his hypothesis that Matthew and

[104] Hartman, *Testimonium Linguae.*

Luke represent a process of formalizing and conserving. A period of Greek oral tradition 'in collegia' is a fascinating possibility and the study of the Genitive Absolute gives some weight to this hypothesis. Such a theory would of course help to explain some of the Minor Agreements between Matthew and Luke in Marcan contexts. Whether or not it is right to speak of a solemn stamp being given to a popular language is less clear.

The comparison of the synoptic uses of the Genitive Absolute with the LXX indicates that, although there are common features of usage between the Synoptists and the LXX, derivation of synoptic usage from the LXX is not particularly evident. Rather, comparison of the LXX uses with the synoptic uses gives further weight to the hypothesis of a homogeneity within the synoptic usage.

This finding underlines the role of tradition in the study of Matthew's Gospel and the role of the author of Matthew in formalizing the tradition. Is there any light to be thrown on the character of that formalizing role from the material which we have assembled? First, it is possible to make a negative judgment. Köhler in his findings on the use of the Gospel of Matthew in the Early Church concluded that the use of the Jesus tradition in Matthew and the use of the Jesus tradition in the Early Fathers were parallel, in that both Matthew and the Early Church show a willingness to interpret the tradition and apply it to fresh circumstances.[105] Already in this chapter the weaknesses in that position have been registered. This comparison of the synoptic usages of the Genitive Absolute in their limited textual tradition with the extraordinarily expanded uses of that construction in the quotations from the Early Fathers adds a further word of caution. From the point of view of syntax there is a major difference between the textual tradition and the quotations of the Early Fathers. The former is conservative; the latter highly creative.

The negative response is thoroughly justified. Is it possible to formulate a more positive response to this syntactical material? There are three features to be explained within the history of the Matthean tradition: the first is the development of the tradition during the period of the synoptic writers within a homogeneous linguistic style and with the help of increasingly insistent formulae; the second is the stabilizing of the text of Matthew by means of a conservative approach to the available tradition as that is reflected in the history of the textual tradition of Matthew, so that there are only minimal exchanges in the use of constructions within the textual tradition over the following centuries; the third is the creative syntax of those who quoted Matthew as distinct from those who copied Matthew. Does this suggest that the formalizing of the tradition could have been, in the first place, a slow

[105] Köhler, *Rezeption*, 200-204, 433.

process in which formulae developed, and then, in the second place, an intentional conserving of the tradition involving a written document produced at a single moment in time, so that considerable attention was given to the detailed recording of that tradition, an attention which then continued over several centuries? If that is a possible reading of the material, and it is a reading which corresponds to other syntactical evidence than simply the Genitive Absolute, then the historical setting of Matthew's language corroborates the hypothesis that Matthew, whatever else the author was doing, was collecting and conserving.

This chapter has been moving systematically toward the possibility of a new genre model. It remains still only a possibility and major areas still need clarification if it is to be treated as anything more than a possibility. But at least it is apparent that the literary hypothesis which claims that Matthew rewrote his main sources is open to serious doubt. Redaction criticism built on that hypothesis a construction involving dubious assumptions and dubious logic. More recent rhetorical, compositional and structuralist work has been insufficiently critical of the literary hypothesis and of what redaction critics constructed on it. If the literary hypothesis is open to question, then an alternative explanation has to be found; it has to explain the complex relationships which form the synoptic problem without assuming a literary handling of a literary deposit. Experience has shown over the last decades that any solution which departs too far from the Streeter hypothesis runs into major problems; so the most helpful explanation is likely to be one which blends the Streeter hypothesis with a different view of the available sources and a different view of how they were used. In the case of Matthew the sources available to Matthew are on the whole not available to us. Changes were taking place which cannot be exactly monitored but which need nevertheless to be posited. The transmission of some parts of those sources can be monitored and the care and exactness of their transmission in Matthew is sometimes quite surprising, particularly when compared with the freedom used by the Early Fathers in their citation of Matthean material. Because some traditions were transmitted exactly and because the sources available to Matthew are on the whole not available to us, it is important to reflect on how far they can represent a single coherent picture. Do the language and thought suggest a conserving of traditions or a freedom in the deployment of traditions or perhaps a mixture of the two? The greater the detail dedicated to the study of Matthean language and syntax the stronger the case becomes for some element of conservation in the Matthean strategy. Associated with that strategy could well be a conservation of the different emphases within the traditions, whatever attempts the writer may have made to bring those different emphases together within a particular perspective The gathering of

the traditions and the shaping of them into a Gospel brings into the centre of the discussion the question of genre. Has Matthew remained sufficiently close to the Marcan tradition for the Marcan biographical genre to be also the Matthean genre? Or has the growth of the material and the shape given to Matthew transported the First Gospel to the limits of the biographical genre and moved it in the direction of a different genre or even into a new genre? So far the argument has only indicated the possibility that Matthew's contract with the hearers could have been based upon the sharing of their traditions, and, given that possibility, that Matthew's Gospel could have moved into a genre distinctive to its task and setting. Such a new genre would have been distinctive to the task of sharing the traditions of different Christian communities and would have given point to such an act of sharing. So far, that possibility of such a function for the Gospel has only been supported by a syntactical analysis which illustrates a formalizing process within the tradition and ways in which the writer of the First Gospel may have contributed to this process. The chapter has marked out a possible route to a new genre model; the seven areas of research on the parables designated in the Introduction may help us to take a step further.

One of the major differences between Mark's Gospel and Matthew's Gospel is that the latter contains so many parables. The Matthean parables are a very significant corpus, and one way of monitoring the shift which has taken place between Mark and Matthew is by examining that body of material. That is one particular way in which research on the Matthean parables can shed light on the structure and purpose of the Gospel of Matthew as a whole. The parables can help to clarify if and to what extent Matthew has moved away from the Marcan genre. The parables come from different traditions and so are evidence regarding the nature of those traditions. They provide evidence as to how Matthew used them. They were included in considerable numbers and that in itself requires comment.

The detailed discussion of the parables can give some assistance in our discussion. But there are some preliminary issues which have to be considered before the detailed analysis can begin. What is meant by a parable? Where do the Matthean parables fit into the history of parables? What are we dealing with when we work with the text of the parables? Without some preliminary answers to those questions it will not be possible to describe the distinctive way in which the parables in Matthew function. Chapter Two attempts to provide those answers.

CHAPTER TWO

WHAT IS A PARABLE ?

What then is a parable? The question is important for this study in several ways. The answer will designate the area to be studied and how it should be studied: what portion of Matthew's Gospel should be analysed and what methods of analysis are appropriate? It will indicate what a parable is in terms of its history: how is a parable to be understood within the developments which led from the work of Jesus of Nazareth to the writing of the Gospels? It will illustrate what a parable is in terms of its functions: how can a parable operate in different contexts, and particularly how might it operate within a large-scale Gospel like Luke or Matthew? It will illuminate how parabolic speech is related to theological understanding: how might the relationship between the Matthean parables and the theological concerns of that Gospel be explored? In terms of establishing the methods for analysing parables in Chapter Three, the definition of a parable is of critical importance.

The definition of a parable is by no means a simple matter: do we mean the parable as Jesus used it, or the parable as the Gospel writer wrote it, or is there some criterion independent of the Gospels by which we may define a parable? If scholars posit the first of these, the 'parable' as that which Jesus used, they often mean by 'parable' a form different from that which appears in the written Gospels. To obtain this they use well-tried procedures, in particular the writing of a history of the Jesus tradition. This includes source-critical work: there are different appearances of the same parable within the synoptic tradition (as well as in material outside the Gospels); a comparison of these variant forms might lead to the designation of some of them as later and some as earlier, and thus perhaps point to the earliest form of all, the form which Jesus used. It also includes theories about the layers of interpretation within the text, and how to distinguish and date them. So a definition of the parable, perhaps understood as a means of communication used by Jesus in his teaching, is dependent on the writing of a parabolic tradition history and on the methods and theories involved in that technique.

Such a parabolic tradition is however a complex entity, and it is not clear how far all its interrelated elements can be identified. The relation of a Marcan form of a parable (e.g. *The Sower*) to its Matthean counterpart is not simply a matter of a tradition handled by an editor, but a historical

process with many constituent parts. There is the history of the vegetation motif which influences how the narrative is rehearsed; there is the history of the persecution and finance themes; there is the association of Jesus with the proclamation of the good news. Alongside the transmission of the parable there is the transmission of its interpretation, an independent transmission in the case of *The Sower*. This is apparent from the discrepancies which appear in the text, discrepancies for example between the Matthean form of the parable and the Matthean form of its interpretation. Such discrepancies, gaps and tensions are part of the history of the parabolic tradition and are hints of influences on the narration which need to be understood and if possible interpreted. Above all there is the question of how the basic tradition is being pressed into the service of an ongoing tradition, and of the many elements in that process: the parable of *The Sower* as a unit of meaning and not just an amalgam of constituent parts, as a transaction implying bonding and commitment, as an invitation to recognize a wider horizon to which the parable points. The theories surrounding these areas have transformed our understanding of the history of tradition from a unilinear construction to a multiform reality, but they also present a maze of theoretical possibilities which must constantly and ruthlessly be assessed: 'generative', 'actualization', 'performance' theories have all been applied to parable research and are part of the study of the parabolic tradition.

Other theories too have a particular relevance to study of Matthew's Gospel. They concern, for example, the relationship of the parables to eschatology: it is generally accepted that parables could have been a proclamation of the Kingdom, although it is disputed whether that Kingdom was present, future, or both; Matthew has a larger number of narrative fictions than any of the other Gospels and a larger number which emphasize the future judgment; does this represent an intensification of one element in Jesus' parables? Or, were some of Jesus' parables a declaration of judgment on his contemporaries, later to be used in the Matthean tradition to expound the place of Gentiles within the early Christian church? Or, were Jesus' parables originally intended to raise fundamental issues concerning behaviour but later became expressions of a distinctively Matthean morality? Such theories about the history of tradition relate specifically to the history of the Matthean parabolic corpus, and source-critical study, by designating some ideas earlier and some later, may assist in their evaluation.

Another approach to the historical question uses form-critical observations. Form criticism operates at a number of different levels. It operates at a synchronic level, classifying similarities and connections between texts which belong to a limited cultural and temporal setting. Parables therefore can be classified as such without reference to a particular place in history or the history of tradition. Form-critical study also operates

at a diachronic level: it examines texts as elements in a process of tradition. But this is a hazardous enterprise in the case of any synoptic material, and particularly so in the case of the parables. It is difficult to establish a satisfactory method of piercing through to forms behind the written traditions of the Gospels. Our evidence for early stages in the transmission of Gospel material is material in a written form, and we cannot be sure of what prior stages may have led to that written form. Some progress has been made in the diachronic use of form-critical work. In the case of the extended aphorisms, for example, it seems possible that modern form criticism may have achieved some success. In the case of the story parables also some progress has been made. However, on the whole, form criticism offers only occasional possible reconstructions of earlier oral traditions.

The assumption behind all these aspects of tradition history is that the 'parables' passed through several, perhaps many, stages on their way into the written Gospel. In the course of the Jesus tradition, changes took place in both form and content. Manifold influences were at work on their shape and use. The problem which we face, therefore, if we attempt to define a parable by reference to the work of Jesus, is that we could be dealing with a different entity at the end of the process of tradition from that which existed at its beginning. In terms of our search for a definition, the diachronic approach to a definition is of only limited help.

In this chapter we shall be looking at these methods and theories in some detail. We shall conclude that if we mean by a parable the form which Jesus used, then we probably have evidence of only a few forms, of only a limited number of distinctive elements which can be traced to him, and that we can reconstruct the detail of individual exemplars of those forms only with difficulty. To judge by the variants which emerged in the course of the history of parables, the tradition was long and complex. The criteria for identifying forms and for judging some to be later and some earlier (for example, by classifying as later those which show signs of 'allegory' or Old Testament allusions) are by no means secure. So if we are dependent on the history of the synoptic tradition for a definition of the parable, then our evidence is limited.

Some scholars argue that to attempt a definition of a 'parable' by reference to the practice of Jesus is not only difficult; it is wrong in principle. Not only is a definition along those lines difficult to achieve; it is based on false assumptions, either because of mistaken method or because of a dogmatic stance. We ought to be examining the range of narrative stories as they appear in the text of the Gospels and regard these as our primary evidence for what a parable is. Perhaps the appearance of the word παραβολή could provide an objective basis for such a definition. In the past, form criticism has tended to work with the assumption that the background for the

'parables' is popular storytelling of a kind known from folk-tales. We should recognize the dependence of the Gospels on literary models rather than on the folk-tale models. Perhaps the Gospel forms and the Gospel classifications should be taken much more seriously, and that is not likely to happen if we concentrate on parables defined only by reference to how Jesus taught.

The attempt to define the parable with reference to the practice of Jesus could of course be wrong in principle, because the attempt might be motivated by dogmatic considerations: Jesus was unique; his teaching must have been unique; therefore the forms of his teaching must have been unique. The definition of the parable has to begin with theories about Jesus' methods of teaching because of who he was and is. The parable was his distinctive form of proclamation and is an essential reflection of that distinctiveness.

An alternative and more constructive method is to collate all the main forms of narrative story in the first century CE, to note how all of them were classified in the contemporary world and to relate the Gospel parables to those classifications. That is a classic illustration of the form-critical synchronic approach. A great deal of such compilatory work has been done recently both on Hellenistic stories and on rabbinic parallels. From that work we can begin to form a judgment as to whether or not a comparative definition of the 'parable' is possible or preferable. If that is a feasible method it gives us an external point of reference for the definition of a parable.

The functional aspect of form-critical work is also important in establishing what a parable is. If the compilatory work to which we have just referred provides a feasible method, we have an external point of reference not only for what a parable is but also for how it functioned. Some argue that it is in terms of what parables achieved that we should seek its definition.

The possibility that literary assumptions could make a contribution to the definition of a parable gave fresh impetus to redaction-critical work on the parables. What forms appear in the Matthean text? What are the factors which make the Matthean corpus of parables a distinctive group in relation to those in the other Gospels? How do they serve the Gospel of Matthew as a whole? What is their literary function, their social and religious function? What literary characteristics do the Matthean parables share, and why? Why are there (comparatively speaking) so many of them and why is the interest in future judgment so strong? This redactional interest in the surface text of Matthew coincides with and is complemented by the interest in the various other forms of literary study of the parables, the study of their narrative character, the dramatic quality of the parabolic texts and their rhetorical

devices. Even if it is difficult to define what a 'parable' is, a discussion of the text of Matthew and Luke can at least help to clarify what kind of entity we are dealing with in those two texts. We can also begin to see where Matthew's material stands in relation to the rest of the parabolic tradition. It may be that the distinctiveness of the Matthean forms is more easily observed if we do not begin with a previously determined definition of what constitutes a parable. We can attempt to describe how the Matthean narratives are used. We can try to assess whether 'parable' is a broader category in Matthew than elsewhere. Perhaps without such a broader category we might fail to recognize an important element in the definition of a 'parable': what the narrative fiction became through the creation of the Gospels.

There is a fourth way in which we can approach the definition of the parable. It concerns the nature of the Gospel and the function of the narrative fictions in relation to the written Gospels: the place of the parables in genre criticism. Some issues here are less helpful: how far is a Gospel as a whole parabolic, so that the narrative fictions are an indication of how the Gospel as a whole should be read? Other issues are material to our discussion: how distinctive is their role within the Gospel material, so that they offer a counterpoint to the other material, to the legal or the 'biographical' material for instance? Can they act as a focus, enabling the reader to understand and respond to the Gospel? Do their distinctive features enable the Gospel to engage the readers at different levels?

Those are four ways of attempting a definition of the parable. The discussion of them will help to establish some of the questions which need to be addressed in Chapter Three and the methods which need to be followed in the parabolic analysis in Part Two.

Since Joachim Jeremias still remains such an influential figure in parabolic research, we must begin by reviewing his classic treatment of the subject. Jeremias[1] makes his main concern the parables of Jesus as Jesus told them, a recapturing of the clarity of Jesus' preaching of the Kingdom as exemplified in the parables. By contrast with the Pauline or rabbinical parables, he argues, the parables of Jesus, once they are heard against the background of Palestinian life and culture, speak with a unique clarity and simplicity. He contrasts this with the desire of the Early Church to find a deeper meaning in the simple words of Jesus. Even within the first decade after the death of Jesus, the parables underwent reinterpretation, particularly through the use of allegory, a technique adapted, according to Jeremias, from the allegorical exegesis of Hellenistic Judaism; and this process was strengthened by the 'hardening' theory which was expressed in the logion in

[1] Jeremias, *Parables,* especially ch. 2; *Rediscovering*, Part II.

Mk 4:11f and associated by Mark erroneously with the parables, giving an impression that the parables were to conceal the mystery of the Kingdom from outsiders. To define the parable we go behind the process, to Jesus' own preaching and the role of the parables in it.

To get behind the process an initial task is to establish a clear distinction between the original setting of the parables and their setting in the life of the Early Church, and to note the 'principles of transformation' which emerge as we seek to move from the later to the earlier setting. These principles are ten in number:

1. Translation.

Translation of the parables into Greek involved a change of meaning. The retranslation of the parables into Jesus' mother tongue is an important, perhaps the most important, aid to the recovery of their original meaning.

2. Representational changes.

It was inevitable that their Palestinian background should be translated into terms of the Hellenistic environment.

3. Embellishment.

There is an early appearance of the tendency to elaborate the parables.

4. The influence of the Old Testament and of folk-story themes.

There is a tendency to illustrate by or to add Scripture references or to use folk-story themes.

5. The change of audience.

The primitive church has largely transferred to the community the parables which were originally addressed to opponents or to the crowd.

6. The hortatory use of the parables by the church.

There has been a frequent shifting of emphasis to the hortatory aspect, especially from the eschatological to the hortatory.

7. The influence of the church's situation.

The primitive church related the parables to its own actual situation, characterized by the Gentile environment, the Gentile mission, and the delay of the Parousia.

8. Allegorization.

The primitive church increasingly tended to interpret the parables allegorically with a hortatory purpose.

9. The collection and conflation of parables.

The primitive church made collections of parables, and this gave rise to the fusion of parables.

10. The setting.

The primitive church gave a setting to the parables and this often produced a change in their meaning; in particular, by the addition of generalizing conclusions, many parables acquired a universal meaning.

Through the use of these ten aids, argued Jeremias, it becomes apparent that the parables were originally a call to decision about the person and mission of Jesus. They sound the urgent note of an eschatology in process of realization. Through every parable shines the veiled kingliness of God's Saviour.

The history of this debate hinges on the question of how scholars have understood the interrelationship of language and reality. The evangelists, argued Jülicher,[2] regarded the parables as allegories, whereas in truth they were originally something quite different; they were similes forming part of Jesus' direct address to his hearers. Allegory and metaphor are characterized by a lack of clarity, and so it is necessary to strip away allegory and metaphor to recapture the original clarity of Jesus' preaching. Linked with this understanding of language was, in Jülicher's case, an appreciation of clarity as the simplicity of truth itself.[3] Scholars who were in agreement with Jülicher that allegory and metaphor belonged together disagreed profoundly with Jülicher's association of simplicity with truth. For Jeremias the clarity of Jesus' authentic word became conceptually identifiable with the Word of God. The association of allegory and metaphor remained; the understanding of how language related to reality changed.

The debate concerning metaphor became central to parabolic research. Some scholars during the last thirty years have followed the new philosophical theories of metaphor as they emerged. In Anglo-Saxon circles the movements were dominated by logical positivism and the responses to logical positivism in the work of Ogden, Richards, Ramsey, Black and Wheelwright.[4] In a different way this was true of C.H. Dodd, although Dodd's view of parabolic metaphor and simile was that they were drawn from life, arresting the mind by their strangeness and teasing the mind into activity. For Dodd this was part of the realism of Jesus' teaching, as if the reality of the world and the reality of God were one and the same.[5] In the aftermath of logical positivism the issue became whether or not metaphor was capable of being reduced to literal usage. Metaphor had became a battleground on which was fought out the issue of whether or not language could have a cognitive religious or aesthetic function.

Parabolic research on the Continent divided along the linguistic distinction between existentialist and non-existentialist, with intermediaries

---

[2] Jülicher, *Gleichnisreden*, I 51-54; van Aarde, *God-with-us*, 231-235.

[3] For nuances in Jülicher's later position, see Klauck, *Allegorie*, 10 n.30.

[4] For a historical perspective, see Kjärgaard, *Metaphor*, 11-12, 133-197; the cross-referencing from one area of research to another is illustrated by Aurelio, *Disclosures*.

[5] Dodd, *Parables*, 22.

such as Gadamer,[6] Ricoeur[7] and von Balthasar[8] providing various possibilities of rapprochement. Aspects of the work of some of these major figures will be considered later. For the moment we note that for all of them their understanding of the interrelation of language and reality had profound effects upon their parabolic exegesis and interpretation. From the Bultmannian school, for example, emerged the New Hermeneutic with its language about speech events, leading with some cross-fertilization from American rhetorical criticism to Weder's view of the parables as bringing to expression a unique understanding of God in a metaphorical form which is itself Gospel.[9] The form is not conditioned by the circumstances in which it came to be; the truth comes to expression in it.

A different series of emphases has emerged from those who, like Berger[10] and Klauck,[11] espouse the interaction theory of metaphor, using the work of Kurz and Weinrich. Kurz and Weinrich[12] had a similar impact on the Continent to that which Black had on the Anglo-Saxon scene: metaphor is not a mundane pairing of similarities but the fuller activity of bringing out similarities in what might previously have been thought dissimilar. In Berger's case his espousal of the interaction theory is associated with an emphasis on the models which provide contexts for the initial minting of the metaphor, which add different gradations of interest to the metaphor. Berger has in mind models such as the world-views which are to be found in the family or the court, the state or the cult. These create an interlocking between the contrasting pairs as well as providing material to elucidate and translate the metaphor for readers of a different time and context. They offer a grammatical play with an open ending, thus protecting the imaginative and associative freedom of the hearer and allowing understanding to be experienced as gift. He is critical of those like Weder who speak of metaphor as world-creating. A speaker does not create reality; that is a hangover from Idealism. A speaker discovers the world, like someone who rows with the current. Words are not world-creators; they are catalysts of experience, offering change for speaker and hearer alike.

The appropriation of the interaction theory of metaphor by Funk[13] was a formative factor within a different tradition, the distinctive American tradition of parabolic scholarship, with its strong rhetorical emphases. Here

---

6 Gadamer, *Wahrheit*, 286-290, 407.
7 Ricoeur, *Hermeneutics*.
8 von Balthasar, *Herrlichkeit*, III,2 313.
9 Weder, *Gleichnisse*, 31-42, 58-96; Vincent, *Self-revelation*.
10 Berger, *Formgeschichte*, 31-36; *Hermeneutik*, 346-365.
11 Klauck, *Allegory*, 141.
12 Weinrich, *Sprache*; *Metapher*, 1180; *Negationen*, 39-63.
13 Funk, *Hermeneutic*, 133-162.

Jülicher's single-point clarity was subverted and the way was cleared for the polyvalent interpretation of metaphor by Crossan and Tolbert.[14] By means of metaphor the parable could open up reality. It could operate as a totality, with all its possibilities, opening up and redescribing reality. Crossan took this redescription of reality to be the shattering of the mythical world, and he has been followed in this by Brandon Scott: the parable of *The Mustard Seed* subverted the picture of the Kingdom in the great Cedar of Lebanon, replacing it with the tiny mustard shrub; the parable of *The Leaven* attacked the identification of the holy with what is unleavened. Experiential elements in this redescription were expounded by Wilder[15] and Perrin,[16] Wilder borrowing insights from the language of myth and Perrin borrowing terminology from Wheelwright. The Kingdom, Perrin argued, is a tensive symbol, the kind of symbolism which cannot be expressed by a single referent.[17]

For the study of the parable the definition of metaphor is of central importance. Almost all the main interpretations of parables begin with a study of metaphor and the relation of metaphor to narrative, asking how metaphor and narrative relate to reality. In an important clarification of the role of metaphor Janet Soskice has defined it in accordance with ancient theory, as chief of the rhetorical tropes and as that figure of speech whereby we speak about one thing in terms which are seen to be suggestive of another.[18] It is primarily a form of language use and the study of it should begin in a linguistic setting. Within a linguistic setting metaphor is not tied to a particular syntactic form. It is established as soon as a semantic nexus is established, however short that text may be. Once established, a metaphor can be extended in a lengthy text, or reused at intervals. The importance of the metaphor's context and the shared beliefs within which metaphor is used also illustrate the value of not tying metaphor to a particular syntactic unit

---

[14] Crossan, *In Parables*; Funk, *Looking Glass Tree, Leaven*; Tolbert, *Perspectives*; Stern, *Perspectives*.

[15] Wilder, *Eschatology, Rhetoric*.

[16] Perrin, *Language of the Kingdom*.

[17] See Via, *Parables, Example, Response*, on the fictionality of parables and their capacity to redescribe the world.

[18] Soskice, *Metaphor*, 15. The definition which Soskice offers is to be distinguished clearly from descriptions as to how metaphors function. The point can be illustrated in relation to metaphor and emotion. Soskice's definition makes clear that metaphor is not a mental event, nor is the impact of a metaphor affective rather than cognitive. This is not to deny emotional associations to the use of a metaphor (154-161). Berger, *Hermeneutik*, recognizes several features of emotionality in the functioning of metaphor: emotional motivation, emotional source, emotional redirection, sympathetic communication, associative tension, feelings as a feature of knowing. This last is dealt with in De Sousa, *Rationality of Emotion*.

or structure. It is not tied, as the interaction theory suggests, to the highlighting of a second referent or subject. Metaphor, when defined as speaking about one thing in terms suggestive of another, designates a unity of subject matter with a plurality of associative networks involving one model or several.

In this designation of a unity of subject matter with a plurality of associative networks a characteristic imaginative strain is involved; and a capacity has been developed in the use of this imaginative modelling to use something relatively well known to explain or explore a state of affairs which is beyond our grasp. Thus metaphor can redescribe and can disclose. This may seem to set metaphor apart from simile, where it is usually assumed no such imaginative strain or modelling element is present. However, although the latter's grammatical form may appear to set it apart ('it is like...'), Soskice insists that some similes are modelling similes rather than illustrative, and the former, separated from their grammatical form, would be a metaphor.[19]

In relation to religious language metaphor may be, as in scientific usage, reality-depicting, and as such may support the religious person's right to make metaphysical claims. The accretion of such images, all of them hesitant and approximating, but tested and tried, selected as being especially adequate to experience (dramatic and pointed, or diffuse), is one of the strengths of religious language, and as such denominates the source of that experience and the character of revelation.[20]

The relevance of this definition to parabolic research is manifold. Three consequences which flow from her discussions and to which Soskice herself refers are: first, the emblematic character of metaphor where the history of its application renders it freighted with meaning: God is 'king', 'rock', 'vine-keeper' (this is clearer terminology than to use in such cases the term 'allegory'); second, in the case of parables which begin 'The Kingdom of Heaven is like...' the real referent is not a particular kind of human experience but the transcendental claim made in relation to that experience; third, if biblical imagery is lifeless to modern humanity, some of the culprits are critics who attempt to salvage the exact words of Jesus from the interpretations with which they are surrounded in the Gospels and to equate them with religious truth; that is, the damage done to religious language may be one of the legacies of historical criticism. A consequence which she recently made clear is of great significance in parabolic research: because a metaphor depends on the establishing of a nexus of terms to map a subject,

[19] Soskice, *Metaphor*, 60.
[20] Soskice, *Metaphor*, chs. 6-8.

a narrative fiction such as a fable, even though it may use speech about one thing in terms of another, cannot strictly be called 'metaphorical'.[21]

At this point an important issue of method arises. Many parabolic studies move from the definition of metaphor to a definition of how metaphor is related to the parable. The view taken here is that precisely because metaphor is a form of speech it can relate to different genres and different forms in different ways. A consequence of the definition is that it is advisable to move from usage to generalization, rather than from generalization to text. Metaphor functions in different ways in different genres. In the novel, the play, the poem, the dialogue, the story, there will be different functions for the metaphor. Murdoch's novel *The Sea, the Sea* uses that central metaphor of the sea in a different way from Shakespeare's use of the storm in his play *The Tempest*. Herbert's poems *The Temple* relate to that metaphor in a distinctive way because they are poems. Similarly metaphor operates in different ways in relation to different forms. In some kinds of parables the metaphor may involve a point of dissonance taken further by means of the narrative; in others the metaphor may be emblematic. It is best to describe first how the metaphor functions and then to seek a correlation between function and form. That is not to suggest that metaphor functions in different ways only according to the form or genre. That would clearly be false; sea imagery within a novel may suggest destructiveness or fecundity. What is suggested is that one single relationship between metaphor and 'parables' is not to be assumed. Indeed, as we have seen in the case of the fable, some narrative parables are not in the strict sense metaphorical at all.

Operative across these literary categories are social and sociological factors. The social context of the one who speaks and the social context of the one who hears are both important. The rural environment suggests metaphors which in an urban setting may be less immediate in their impact, although the act of imagination can compensate for that loss of immediacy. Sociological categories indicate how circumstances, especially times of crisis, generate metaphor. Leadership and vision express themselves in creative imagery, as in Churchill's description of the Iron Curtain coming down across Europe.

---

[21] The relation of metaphor to narrative has proved a problem with many definitions of metaphor: Ricoeur, *Hermeneutics*; Kjärgaard, *Metaphor*, ch. 5. Heininger, *Metaphorik*, 21-28, emphasizes the factor of incongruity in his definition of metaphor, which enables a new story to emerge in scenically arranged movements. This distinguishes the Parable from the Example story; in the former the new story of the Kingdom can emerge, whereas the latter only expresses the values of the Kingdom. The particular cases of fable and example parable will be considered later in detail when the identification of metaphorical incongruity with Jesus' distinctive narrative style will be questioned.

The interrelationship of metaphor and context is a fruitful area of study.[22] The choice of metaphor can sometimes reflect the writer's world-view; for example, in the case of the classical poet Euripides[23] the range of metaphor indicates a new assessment of the human and natural environment in terms of its valuation through the senses. Metaphor has distinctive functions in relation to the contexts of prayer and public worship, liturgy and ritual. Turner's *Dramas, Fields and Metaphors* examines the role of metaphor in ritual and worship as well as in social and community contexts, and Worgul's *From Magic to Metaphor* explores the role of ecclesial root metaphors in the interrelationship of individual development and community sacramental life.[24] All these developments in the understanding of how metaphor operates are relevant to the parabolic metaphor.

Partly because Soskice's definition is a literary definition it has aroused criticism. Specialists in the psychology of religious language have suggested that a literary definition is reductionist. It has been suggested by Williams and Watts[25] that Soskice's definition for metaphor excludes a significant range of metaphorical usage, the so-called 'double aspect' terms such as 'light' and 'body'. From the standpoint of the psychology of religious language these are crucially important elements, since their origin can be traced to a period of human experience before the clear differentiation of subjective experience and the material world. These, along with prototypical symbols and events, are the means by which the dynamic tension between religion and myth is sustained. But the literary definition of metaphor is not intended to preclude psychological commentary, any more than it is intended to preclude sociological, liturgical or theological commentary. It simply provides a clear basis for discussion in each of those areas.

Renewed attention has also been paid to the distinction between metaphor and analogy. In general terms the distinction between metaphor and analogy can be stated as follows: 'analogy' is a term designating the range of linguistic usage by which language is stretched to fit new applications without generating for the native speaker any imaginative strain. Metaphor relies on established dissimilarities between the things compared; analogy disavows the necessity or possibility of specifying such dissimilarities. Historically the distinction between metaphor and analogy has been made

---

22 Soskice, *Metaphor*.

23 Barlow, *Imagery*.

24 Turner, *Dramas*, analyses times of social tension to examine how metaphors arise in relation to ordinary life as formative elements alongside symbol and ritual as bonding factors for a community. See Worgul, *Magic*, 184ff.

25 Watts, *Religious Knowing*, 131-150.

with reference both to denial and to qualification.[26] Metaphors can be denied but must not be qualified; analogies should not be denied but must be qualified. Necessary for analogical use is that a term should be capable of being stretched without breaking, that we are aware of the imperfect use of such analogies when we use them with reference to God, but we can and must use them nevertheless inasmuch as God is their source and cause.[27]

From this brief survey of the history of metaphor in recent research it is clear that the definitions on which Jülicher and Jeremias based their work cannot stand. It suggests that in some parables emblematic language, that is (in Jeremias's terms) allegorical language, is unavoidable. It is no more avoidable in the New Testament parables than it is in the Old Testament prophetic oracles. It suggests a different route to a Christological understanding of the parables, since it questions the stress on incongruity, exaggeration and dissonance which so many scholars identify as a mark of uniqueness in the teaching of Jesus, just as it also rejects the claim that 'Christ is a metaphor'. It makes clear that the context within which the parables are to be understood, like the context in which the Old Testament prophets worked, is one in which the divine purpose is being fulfilled. Narrator and audience are caught up in a dynamic interplay of spoken word, gesture, report, action and fulfilment.[28] This is the context which we shall need to explore. It is an ancient context and places metaphor and imagery in the setting to which the discussion of the parables properly belongs. Our brief survey of metaphor also indicates that some parables, such as those which are closer to the pattern of a fable, are not strictly speaking metaphorical; no semantic nexus is established. They are narrative fiction, and narrative fiction is a further area of parabolic research which will have to be considered.

Having seen the disadvantages in Jeremias's understanding of language and reality we turn now to his 'principles of transformation'. They are of somewhat uncertain status: are they inferences from the practice of synoptic criticism or from a theory of parabolic origins? Whatever their status, and however popular they may have been, their usefulness today is open to serious doubt.

1. *Translation*

It is claimed that the parables were translated into Greek from Jesus' mother tongue. Retranslation of them back into Aramaic is an important guide to

[26] Lash, *Theology*, Part III.
[27] McCabe, *Analogy*, 106; Ward, *Barth, Derrida*, ch. 12.
[28] Stacey, *Prophetic Drama*.

their original meaning, and Jeremias himself experimented widely with this. He used 'variations in translation' in the Gospel tradition as guides to uncover the underlying Aramaic wording.

However, although recent discoveries have enlarged our understanding of the history of the Aramaic language,[29] this area of research has made us more keenly aware of how difficult it is to identify precisely how Jesus spoke. Retranslation is recognized to be far more complex as a procedure:[30] the problems of differing word fields, of levels of formal equivalence and semantic tolerance, of language fusion, and of the limited nature of the evidence with respect to Jesus' place and time, are now more fully appreciated.

Retranslation is practised with renewed accuracy, using a range of technical skills.[31] But these are particularly suited to the retranslation of sayings. The parables introduce additional complications, since in their case translation has to consider issues of narrative style and vocabulary registers; and the variations between the Gospel parables represent translation variants less frequently than do the variations between the sayings.

2. *Representational Changes*

In the process of translation into Greek, says Jeremias, the Palestinian background was 'translated' into the Hellenistic environment. In the Lucan parables Jeremias found turns of phrase that presuppose Hellenistic building techniques (as, for example, in the use of cellars in Lk 6:47f) and non-Palestinian horticulture (as in Lk 13:19).

However, the distinction between the original stories as Jesus told them and their form in later transmission may require more than a transfer from a Palestinian background to a Greek Hellenistic background. For example, the stories which Jesus told need not have depended only on his own immediate

---

[29] Porter, *Language*; Beyer, *Texte*. I am grateful to Dr. Horbury for his paper to Professor Hooker's New Testament Seminar drawing attention to the evidence from inscriptions regarding language usage in first-century CE Palestine and for his suggestion that the social and educational factors would be appropriate for their evaluation; see Horbury, *Inscriptions*.

[30] Hurst, *Semantics*; Emerton, *Problem*; Chilton, *Rabbi*; Schwarz, *Urgestalt*.

[31] Casey's work is technically superb: see *The Cup*, 11-12, and *Son of Man*. His work on the saying of Jesus over the cup at the Last Supper shows the advantages and limitations of such translation. It illuminates what the original could have been and what it could have meant. It does not however answer the question raised by those who doubt that any Jew could have associated drinking wine with a statement such as 'This is my blood' (see Casey, *The Cup*, 9; Stacey, *Last Supper*).

experience. Could he not also have used a common popular mythology as to how Hellenistic royal courts operated? Or again, was there no use of popular Hellenistic epigrams or stories such as the fables in early first-century CE rural Palestinian education?[32] We shall see later that both these questions are well justified.

That representational changes did take place can be readily conceded. But this does not mean, as Jeremias appears to imply, that the authentic settings will necessarily be found within the synoptic material: Lk 6:47f might well not be an authentic setting for the parable and Mt 7:24-27 is unlikely to be an authentic alternative to it; it is certainly secondary and probably Syrian.

3. *Embellishment*

One of the parables considered by Jeremias under this heading is the parable of *The Talents* (Mt 25:14-30/Lk 19:12-27/Gospel to the Hebrews). He argues that the original parable was a stern warning to the Jewish leaders of Jesus' day of the coming day of reckoning, that it concerned the unexpected return of a nobleman, that in the pre-Lucan tradition the original parable had been fused with another parable reflecting the events of the life of Archelaus, and that later versions had moralized the parable and given it a Parousia context and interpretation. Thus the later embellishments can be identified and stripped away, leaving the parable suited to its original eschatological context.

It is significant that there is nowadays little agreement regarding the original significance of this parable. The methods used to identify this original form and purpose have not produced generally acceptable conclusions. Recent linguistic analyses of the parable in Matthew and Luke point to a much greater dependence of both writers on traditional material than is immediately explicable in terms of their own purposes.[33] The complex character of the details in Matthew and Luke has been traced to such fundamentally different influences[34] that it is more difficult now to adjudicate between them. The authentic cannot be distinguished from secondary characteristics. The range of purposes suggested for the original parable extends from the strongly eschatological to the primarily hortatory. Moreover it is recognized now that if once we assume, as Jeremias did, that earlier versions of the parable involved a popular oral style of storytelling, then embellishments are just as likely to be part of those earlier stages as

---

[32] Hengel, *Hellenization*, 52.

[33] Marshall, *Luke*, 700-704.

[34] Derrett, *Talents*; see the discussion on pp.470-472.

they are to be later theological reworkings of parabolic material.[35] It would appear that Jeremias's attempt to recover a simple, direct utterance shorn of embellishments has become impracticable.

What we shall discover later is that the Matthean form of this parable of *The Talents* has a distinctively Matthean character, and features of its construction and style are only to be found in Matthew. The suggestion is sometimes made that the variants provided by the Gospels, such as the two forms of this parable, could go back to the use and reuse by Jesus of the same parable. As a preacher may preach a sermon differently in two different situations, so Jesus used the same parable in different contexts. But that theory does not harmonize with the fact that the Matthean form of the parable belongs to a Matthean pattern not found elsewhere in the Synoptic Gospels. It is difficult to argue that such a form could ever have formed part of the parabolic teaching of Jesus, when it is only found in a Matthean construction and style, when only Matthew uses that construction and style, and when that construction and style are not represented elsewhere in any part of the Jesus tradition. We shall discover that the same can be said of the Lucan parables; some of the Lucan parables have distinctively Lucan forms.[36] Jeremias's guideline on embellishments is open to serious question and his preference for Luke as a guide to the original form and intention of the parables of Jesus is also questionable as a basis for their study.

4. *The Influence of the Old Testament and of Folk-story Themes*

Jeremias observed the secondary character of the references to Scripture and to folk-story themes among the parables, and the increased number of such references in the Gospel of Thomas. The question remains however whether all such references are a result of Early Church additions. May they not on occasion, for example, have been the result of Jesus' own reflection on Old Testament material, history or themes?[37] Behind Jeremias's suggestion stands a fundamental question: did the original parables of Jesus never

---

[35] Scott, *Parable*, 18, quoting Petuchowski's judgment on the Yohanan ben Zakkai parable, that its original form was fuller than that preserved in the Tosefta but shorter than that of the Midrash. Scott concludes that it is futile to seek the original words of a parable. It is the 'originating structure' that has to be reconstructed.

[36] Bailey, *Poet and Peasant*; Heininger, *Metaphorik*, recognizes Luke's debt to tradition but argues that often the redactional level is high, various communities are reflected in the traditions, and paradigmatic for Luke is the monologue (18:2-5; 12:16-20; 15:11-24), parallel to that found in contemporary drama.

[37] Chilton, *Rabbi*, 114.

involve targum, midrash, exegesis or quotation from the Old Testament? Some of the features which we shall find in the parable of *The Feast* (the invitation, morality, allegorization) can be traced to Old Testament motifs. Is there any reason why they should not in part be attributable to Jesus' own use of Old Testament motifs? Yohanan ben Zakkai's *The Feast*, one of the earliest rabbinic parallels to the parables of Jesus, is, in the form known to us at least, based on an Old Testament passage.[38]

The same applies to folk-story motifs. Jeremias takes the example of the Parable of *The Treasure* in the GThom Logion 109 and suggests that folk-story motifs have entered it through a rabbinic commentary on a scriptural passage. The wider range of treasure-trove motifs which have been collated more recently makes such a precise borrowing extremely unlikely.[39] They make it unwise to assume that Jesus' use of the theme involved no folk-story motifs whatsoever.[40]

5. *The Change of Audience*

A change of audience is suggested by Jeremias for the parable of *The Sheep* (Lk 15:3-7; Mt 18:12-14).[41] Luke has preserved the original situation: Jesus is vindicating the good news against its critics and declaring God's delight in forgiving the sinner; in Matthew, by contrast, the parable addresses the disciples and is part of a call to faithful pastorship in the Christian community. An originally apologetic parable has assumed a different, hortatory character.

This is a very attractive argument, partly because it finds a home for the original parable in one of the most appealing contexts of Jesus' life, his association with sinners.[42] But there are questions which need to be addressed to Jeremias: first, may not the source-critical study of this parable lead back to a Q doublet without an explicit context; and second, do not the discussions of the parable suggest that its central metaphor is of an 'emblematic' character, i.e. that it belongs within an ancient interweaving of references and usages?[43] These two questions raise the possibility that we may be faced in the case of this parable with a wandering narrative capable

---

38 Neusner, *Yohanan*, 239.
39 Crossan, *Finding, Treasure*.
40 For the literature on this issue, see Fieger, *Thomas*, 270 n.463.
41 Jeremias, *Parables*, 28.
42 Sanders, *Historical*, 233-237; Meyer, *Aims*, 137-138; Borg, *Conflict*, 89f.
43 Soskice, *Metaphor*, 159.

of responding in various ways to a very flexible metaphor.[44] Whether in the case of such a parable it is helpful to provide a precise original audience is an important question, not least because to do so might be to misjudge its possible range of reference.

6. *The Hortatory Use of the Parables by the Church*

This principle assumes that parables of Jesus which were originally eschatological were later used by the church as practical advice on everyday behaviour. The parable *On Going before the Judge* (Mt 5:25-26/Lk 12:58f) was originally, as in Luke's Gospel, about the imminent crisis, whereas later it was used (as in Matthew) to provide practical advice.

This passage raises a particular case in the debate about metaphorical narratives. Young, for example, suggests that the parable *On Going before the Judge* should be heard alongside Prov 25:8: 'Do not go hastily to argue your case: otherwise what will you do in the end when your neighbour puts you to shame?' and alongside Mt 5:40/Lk 6:29-30.[45] This latter logion was used by the Early Church as a principle to guide Christians in the matter of legal practice and general attitudes.[46] This could have been the case with Mt 5:25-26/Lk 12:58f. It could of course be that Jeremias is right, that the parable *On Going before the Judge* was originally a parable of imminent crisis, and that practical circumstances such as those which Christians encountered in Corinth required its reinterpretation; from being a parable of imminent crisis it became literal advice for those faced with legal disputes. But in the case of Mt 5:40/Lk 6:29f the original purpose of the saying could have been to advise a detached attitude to property and a willingness to give way on the matter of personal rights. If that was a level at which Jesus offered instruction, then why should not the parable *On Going before the Judge* have been intended by Jesus to be of use at that level? However, it may be that theological and eschatological allusions were both implied at the original, literal, legal level of utterance; the human lawcourt and divine lawcourt were both implied within the parable, the one implied by the other. In that case the simple picture which Jeremias offered, of a shift from eschatological to hortatory, is unsatisfactory. The parable could in fact be classed as metaphorical. It is metaphorical in the sense that it works, as the

---

[44] One of the first of Jeremias's pupils to discuss this problem was Wrege, *Überlieferung*, 63, 135.

[45] Young, *Parables*, 29; pace Davies, *Matthew*, I 519.

[46] Vischer, *Auslegungsgeschichte*, 16-17; Harvey, *Commands*, 74-76.

Proverbs text did, allusively and powerfully within the limited area of a well-known religious tradition.[47]

Once the question of an original hortatory sense for one parable has been raised, the question of the place of hortatory teaching in the life and work of Jesus of Nazareth can be raised in general. That question has been asked in relation to the proverbs and aphorisms in the Gospels. There the material concerns wealth, character, status, humility; and it reflects on human responsibilities and on the nature of God. At the very least the Wisdom material suggests that Jesus was concerned with living faithfully before God and understanding his faithfulness and mercy in relation to everday life and the world around. His teaching was concerned with the nature of God, the nature of the world and our lives in the light of God's presence, justice and promises. It is possible to go further than that, and to suggest how such an emphasis relates to or corrects the current theories concerning Jesus' proclamation of the Kingdom of God. Perhaps the parable *On Going before the Judge* implies a new kind of audience for ethical advice. The incapacity of the hearer as a debtor to make sufficient repayment suggests as much. Actions of profound importance can now be expected of those from whom earlier little could have been expected. The impoverished and despised have a new dignity within the will of God; they are those from whom responsibility is anticipated. The presuppositions on which moral conduct had hitherto been based were being questioned. The questioning of those foundations and the message of the Kingdom belong together, particularly in Matthew's Gospel.

7. *The Influence of the Church's Situation*

There can be little doubt that the circumstances of the Early Church influenced the transmission of the parables. Jeremias makes two specific suggestions. First, the church's missionary situation influenced the transmission of the parables, and he offers the parable of *The Feast* (Mt 22:1-14/Lk 14:16-24) as an illustration. In Luke the repeated invitation to come to the feast does not belong to the original form of the parable (see Mt 22:9), since the original parable envisages not the admission of Gentiles through missionary work but an inrush of Gentiles at the eschatological hour. Luke's form is therefore a secondary form accommodated to the actual situation of the primitive church. In Matthew the additional episode of the

[47] See Soskice, *Metaphor*, 154-155, on the parallel of Japanese court poetry, in which a poet could pick up an allusion from poetry created two hundred years before and expect that his audience would be acquainted with the image and its resonances.

man without a wedding garment illustrates the concern of the primitive missionary church to establish the place of moral responsibility within a Gospel of free grace.

The history of tradition in the case of this parable is exceptionally complex, and if Jeremias's seventh principle were taken to imply that by adjusting the understanding of mission in Luke and revising the emphasis on morality in Matthew we can discover the original form of the parable, then the argument would be highly misleading. That can hardly have been Jeremias's intention. If, for example, the Matthean and Lucan parables are traced back in strictly literary terms to a single Q narrative source, it would probably be to a parable based on the 'replacement' motif: God has chosen a new people in place of the old. Any Lucan and Matthean adjustments which were made would have been made to that particular earlier source or to a form of that source; and there is no way of knowing if their source reflected Jesus' original intention. Jeremias was well aware of the problem; at a later stage in his discussion he admits the complexity of the history of tradition in the case of *The Feast*; he discusses the allegorization which has been at work there. When Jeremias's total argument is considered it is clear that he saw how long the route back to the original parable was.

A second way in which the situation of the Early Church is said by Jeremias to have influenced the transmission of the parables is the supposed 'delay of the Parousia': narrative features concerning the lateness of a king or a master or a bridegroom were in Mt 24:48 or 25:5 originally unstressed; they were given a fresh significance by early Christians as they awaited the Parousia. The phrase the 'delay of the Parousia' can of course carry many different meanings.[48] In Jeremias's work it implies that a change of emphasis took place in the expectation of the Early Church from that of Jesus. Whereas Jesus emphasized the outbreak of a calamity without any firm time commitment, the Early Church looked for the end of the calamity and the coming of the Lord. The parables reflect that change of emphasis: there is a particular interest in the period of time during which disaster, persecution and temptation will have to be endured.[49] The phrase 'delay of the Parousia' can also be used in other ways. Those who posit a more radical break between the expectation of the Early Church and that of Jesus understand the phrase in this way: Jesus knew that the end was very near; the Early Church had to justify and explain its postponement. Grässer's classic definition makes 'Parousia delay' a sense of acute uncertainty. This attached itself to the church's expectation as early Christians wrestled with the 'only form of eschatological hope which Jesus entertained', a hope of

[48] Marshall, *Eschatology*.
[49] Jeremias, *Rediscovering*, 39.

near-fulfilment. It was an acute uncertainty for which the Gospels had to offer justification and explanation, of a kind which the eschatological parables provide.[50] So in the case of Mt 24:48 χρονίζει is neither a subsidiary feature of the story, showing the testing circumstances in which the servant of 24:48 has to work, nor simply that feature taken up into the church's experience of the Parousia's delay. It represents the church's creative response through the organization of the parable, qualifying the expectation of an early day of reckoning. A third way of understanding 'the delay of the Parousia' minimizes the difference between what Jesus said and what the Early Church said: there is an interval before the end according to the church's understanding of salvation-history, but this is not a shift in understanding to meet a disappointment; rather it is a time of joy over the salvation-historical events which centre on Jesus' own promise. His promise was that the end, associated closely with his own ministry, death and return, would come suddenly in a short space of time; in this the teaching of Jesus and the proclamation of the church differed little, the church maintaining that he would come suddenly although in a space of time of indefinite duration capable of being further extended.[51]

The New Testament evidence for the second position is limited, and the salvation-historical perspective expounded by the third forces the New Testament material into a mould ill-suited to all its contents. The first too has serious weaknesses, not least because in intertestamental literature the end days are understood as covering many different stages and extended periods of time. How Jesus saw the future in relation to himself is also unclear. Jesus himself could have seen his own death as part of the initial woes after which other periods would follow;[52] alternatively he may have grasped from the Psalms, the Prophets and the Martyrs the cost of being a divine agent and the hopes of restoration to follow.[53]

Despite all these difficulties certain points are clear: it is clear that expectations in the Early Church of a swift arrival of the end in some cases caused problems about Christian responsibility (1 Thess 4:10–5:22), and that the death of Christians before the Parousia was a deeply felt problem, requiring comfort and guidance. It is also clear that phrases in Mt 24:48 and 25:5 which may originally have been a traditional part of fictional narratives were given eschatological significance (implying belief either in an early or a late Parousia). What place these parables had in the eschatological teaching of Jesus or of the Early Church is far less easy to say in any detail. The

[50] Grässer, *Problem*.
[51] Cullmann, *Salvation*.
[52] Allison, *End of the Ages*, 137.
[53] Grayston, *Dying, We Live*, ch. 5.

judgment theme in Jesus' teaching is authentic and original[54] and warns of an impending disaster facing those who have refused God's offer, although by no means only of an impending disaster. Through his servants God had consistently offered life and renewal and this had been consistently refused. Jesus recognized his own vocation within that pattern, and he issued his warnings in the form of parables.[55] So it is possible to agree with Jeremias to a limited extent: 'the delay of the Parousia' affected the interpretation of these parables; but it could well be that the Early Church's understanding of the 'delay of the Parousia' was part of a far more complex understanding of the future than Jeremias assumed. It could have involved initially a restatement of the prophecies of Jesus rather than a fear of their delay or a denial of their immediate fulfilment. But that lies a long way back in the past as far as the Gospel form of the parables is concerned. What we have in the Gospel parables has to be worked out parable by parable. The Matthean parables have individually and collectively their own story to tell. That is a safer method than to insist from the beginning that they must all cohere with a single definitive eschatological pattern.

This seventh principle has been difficult to evaluate. In part its inclusion in the list of guidelines was obviously right. The parables were retold against the background of the church's life and witness. Of that there is little doubt. But behind the use of Jeremias's guidelines there are often significant assumptions: if we assume that by adjusting the understanding of mission and revising the moral approach, or by discounting the effects of the Parousia delay, the original forms of the parables can be restored, then the assumptions would have been ill-advised. Jeremias himself appreciated the complexity of the parabolic tradition, and this means that he was as aware as anyone that the route via this guideline to authentic parables is treacherous to negotiate.

8. *Allegorization*

Jeremias nominates three particular areas of allegorization in the parables: Christology ('...the thief, the bridegroom, the master of the house, the merchant, the king, were interpreted of Christ, where originally the self-

---

[54] Reiser, *Gerichtspredigt*, 294 and passim.

[55] The classic examples are the parables (Mt 12:22-36 and par) *The Kingdom, The Town, The House* and *The Strong Man,* which in the context of the Beelzebub controversy confront the opponents of Jesus with the danger in which they stand. For the likely historical character of this debate, see Yates, *Spirit.* On the early dating of Mt 10:13-16/Lk 10:13-16, see Theissen, *Lokalkolorit*, 49-61.

revelation of Christ was for the most part veiled...'),[56] reward and punishment ('the supper of salvation...the outer darkness'), and thirdly points of secondary detail. In a survey of the various source-critical levels of parabolic material he finds allegorization in all but the special Lucan material, and concludes that originally all the material was as free from allegorization as the Lucan. The introduction of allegorization by the Early Church was often, as in the case of the interpretation of the Marcan parable of *The Sower*, with the purpose of drawing practical exhortations from the text. Only by discarding those features can we arrive at the original meaning of the parables.

The word 'allegorization' is dangerous because of its ambiguity. It requires very careful definition and the contribution of Klauck[57] to this process is of major importance. Following ancient patterns of nomenclature he distinguishes allegory, allegorese and allegorization. Allegory is defined as one of the few basic modes of speech; it is a rhetorical and poetic procedure capable of being used in various literary genera, and resulting, through the use of metaphor, in the addition of a 'symbolic' (we might say 'emblematic') dimension to the text; allegorese is an exegetical method available for use on a wide range of texts, tending to an interpretation which disregards the intention of the original and offers a revelation of truth to the chosen, and found sometimes in the form of a Dream[58] or Vision Interpretation,[59] with point-by-point explanation of the details of the vision; allegorization is then reserved as a term for the subsequent working over of a text, especially of a parabolic text, during extended oral or literary stages, particularly of its allegorical or metaphorical features, for example through the redactional process of setting the smaller and larger Gospel units in new contextual relationships or giving epic narratives a wider possible range of reference.

The consequences of this definition for the study of Jesus' parables are considerable. Using 'allegorical' in this threefold way we can accept that from a literary point of view the original parables of Jesus may well have had 'allegorical' elements. As we have seen, it was just as natural for Jesus to use 'emblematic' or 'allusive' language as it was for the Old Testament prophets to do so. Jeremias's exclusion of such material from the parables of Jesus on the grounds that they are allegorical elements can no longer be upheld. Klauck maintains that the parables are unavoidably 'allegorical'. This is certainly true of the parables in their literary context. The reference

---

[56] Jeremias, *Parables*, 52.

[57] Klauck, *Allegorie*.

[58] For an example of this, see the Dream of the Cedar and the Palm in 1QapGen XIX and Fitzmyer, *Commentary*, 99-101, on ושביק ארזא בטלל תמרתא.

[59] See Zech 4:1-14 (MT and LXX).

of the parables was to the inbreaking of the Kingdom, and it is a characteristic of allegory, as the ancient rhetorical teachers understood it, that the text should point in one direction and the reference point in another; the text spoke of a feast, and the reference was to the Kingdom; they hinted at Christological claims; they interacted with the situation in which the words were originally spoken; they did violence to reality; they employed metaphor and allusion. From a literary point of view they were unavoidably 'allegorical'. Allegorization was a subsequent process; it was a result of a later editing of the parables. It increased during the post-Easter period due to the attaching of further metaphorical or allusive elements to the older tradition, through the making explicit of the implicit Christology and through the contributions of those who transmitted and edited the material. The effect of this was to increase the level of the allusiveness there. Quite different, but still within the parabolic material, are the examples of allegorese. Allegorese is an exegetical method, such as we find in the interpretation of the parable of *The Sower*, with its point-by-point interpretation of the text. The classification is appropriate on formal grounds. It is appropriate also on stylistic grounds since the grammatical form of the interpretation of *The Sower* closely parallels that of the Vision Interpretations in Zechariah.[60]

We shall need to give further consideration to all the points which Klauck has made. The discussion of allegorese is especially interesting in relation to the Matthew; there is a further example of point-by-point exegetical interpretation in the parable of *The Tares*; there are 'fictional narratives' in Matthew which can be regarded as Visions (e.g. 25:31-46), and the final parables in the Chapter of Parables (Mt 13) can be interpreted in the light of the formula quotation in 13:35: ἀνοίξω ἐν παραβολαῖς τὸ στόμα μου, ἐρεύξομαι κεκρυμμένα ἀπὸ καταβολῆς [κόσμου]. Allegorese offers a significant area of research within the Matthean parabolic material, as it does, with different assumptions, within the patristic use of the parables. Essentially what Klauck has done is to return the boundary posts to where they stood in ancient times. Allegory is a basic mode, a poetic and rhetorical procedure found in many different types of speech, where, as Quintilian put it, 'aliud verbis aliud sensu ostendit';[61] allegorization is a process of increasing allegorical elements in the process of transmission; allegorese is exegesis of a narrative. Allegory in itself no longer provides a means of distinguishing authentic Jesus material from inauthentic. It was a feature of parables from the beginning.

---

60 Lemcio, *Structure*.

61 Quintilian, *Inst Or* vii.6.44.

9. *The Collection and Conflation of Parables*

There can be little doubt that the Early Church made collections of parables and we shall find a great deal of evidence of this among the Matthean parables. There is less evidence for the theory that the making of such collections led to the fusion of parables. For example, Jeremias suggests that the parable of *The Door* in Lk 13:24-30 resulted from a fusion of Mt 25:10-12 with the three similes in Mt 7:13f,22f and 8:11f; but this neglects the strong possibility that Mt 7:13ff and Mt 25:10-12 belong to two separate traditions, the first of which formed a basis for the Sermon on the Mount and the second of which belonged to a triplet of parables. Lk 13:25, as its unusual syntax suggests, probably had a distinct tradition history independent of both. Not only is Jeremias's suggestion unlikely on his own source-critical terms; it is also unlikely that terms such as 'fusion' and 'transferring of features' between parables are appropriate vocabulary for the processes involved in parabolic transmission.

10. *The Setting*

In establishing the tenth principle Jeremias gives considerable emphasis to redaction-critical work. Only by redaction-critical means is it possible to specify what changes have taken place in the context of the parables and in their introductions and conclusions. Unfortunately, as we shall discover in the discussion of the Matthean parables, the problems of redactional method which were described in Chapter One lay his judgments open to serious doubt: the introductions may in some cases belong to pre-Matthean groupings; the parabolic conclusions, far from being hortatory adjustments, could in some cases be integral to the purpose of the parable, although not necessarily to the original purpose of the parable. Mt 25:29 is such an example. Although originally, as Jeremias argues, a wandering logion, its use does not adjust the meaning of the parable of *The Talents*. It corroborates the parable's main thrust.

We included in our study of the definition of a 'parable' Jeremias's ten principles because of the enormous influence which his work has had. Few scholars have so dominated one particular field of New Testament research. His definition of a parable, implied in those principles, was that the parable was a unique form, presenting with clarity and simplicity, when it is understood against the background of Palestinian life, the eschatological message of Jesus. Such a parable could only be found by looking through the Gospels to a history beyond them. Our examination of the principles or guidelines for recovering the message of the parables suggests that his

attempt to get back to the utterances of Jesus, shorn of their later embellishments and Hellenistic elements, is hazardous, and that in so far as it is possible to reach the level of Jesus' authentic message, the parables may not express exclusively the eschatological message of Jesus nor only the message which Jeremias specified. The complexity of the history of tradition makes the journey back long and uncertain, and all the more so now, because so many of the signposts which Jeremias attempted to set up have had to be removed. That is particularly true of the fifth of them, the guideline of 'allegorization'. His definition of the parable is therefore an unreliable reconstruction. It is also an unhelpful reconstruction, in so far as it diverts our attention from what is to be found in the Gospels, preventing us from seeing what is actually there. What is actually there is a rich variety of forms, and these are best approached without the definition which Jeremias offered.

We turn now to four major areas of parabolic study, using developments in source, form, literary and genre criticism. First, the developments based on source-critical insights. We shall note particularly the work of two schools, the Jerusalem and Lucerne groups. The Jerusalem school founded by Lindsey and Flusser[62] posits an original Hebrew Urevangelium and a stemma of relationships allowing for the possible originality of Matthean or Lucan texts over against Mark. It has the great advantage of suggesting a simple explanation for one of the problems with which we wrestled in Chapter One: the different level of agreement between Matthew and Luke in parts of the double tradition, and the levels of their agreement with Mark in the triple tradition. Lindsey suggests an explanation for this in terms of what he calls the Marcan Cross Factor: Mark appears to be responsible, through not being available at certain points, for the presence of verbal agreement between Matthew and Luke, and, by being available in the triple tradition, Mark appears to be responsible for their disagreements. That is to say, Mark, rather than being an original source, could be a corrupting influence in the tradition, with more serious effects on Matthew than on Luke. Already in the previous chapter, particularly in the references there to the Appendix, we have seen difficulties emerging for such a theory. Nevertheless the usefulness of the Jerusalem school is that it requires of us an initial agnosticism as to where originality and authenticity are to be found in the parabolic material. The reference to a Hebrew Urevangelium is also intriguing since it reminds us that the home of the parabolic form might be the Hebrew language rather than Aramaic. The Jerusalem theory is that the synoptic tradition reflects a Hebrew original translated literally into Greek, rearranged and reorganized so that original contexts and settings were

[62] Lindsey, *Synoptic*; Flusser, *Gleichnisse*.

lost; the Synoptists had however an earlier, perhaps lection-based, Life of Jesus which provided Luke with a basic outline, and it is this latter source which causes the different levels of agreement mentioned above. The stemma of the tradition correspondingly shows two beginnings, the Urevangelium and the Life of Jesus. On this theory the contributions of the authors of the Synoptists are easily recognizable in unique vocabulary and literary techniques. This means that the Jerusalem school is willing to explore the parabolic tradition for original material, without the usual presuppositions: original features and forms might be found in Matthew, Mark or Luke. They are also searching for signs of Hebrew originals and are relatively confident that they can find them.

Using this source-critical freedom, Flusser[63] examines the clusters of motifs among the parables and the ways in which the motifs are woven together. He found that the motifs corresponded to those used in rabbinic teaching. As in rabbinic haggadah, the clustering of motifs served to communicate particular themes and a distinctive message. So, for example, the theme of wisdom and folly is presented through the use of several different motifs. In the parable of *The Two Houses* (Mt 7:24-27) it is presented by means of the contrast between two builders. In the parable of *The Ten Young Women* (Mt 25:1-13) it is presented through the motif of readiness or unreadiness for the return of the bridegroom, as in the rabbinic parallel the same theme is depicted through preparedness or unpreparedness for the return of the king's clothes. In the case of Jesus the theme is wisdom and folly in the face of the return of the Son of Man; in the case of the rabbinic parables it is wisdom and folly in the face of the recall of the human spirit to God.

Flusser argues therefore that the parables of Jesus are derived from the environment of the world of rabbinic instruction and that the rabbinic parables and parables of Jesus belong to a common genre. They use the same or similar motifs to present similar themes and for a similar purpose. He distinguishes this classic anecdotal type of parable, with its strong moral imperative, from the later exegetical use of the parable by rabbis, and posits as a context for the development of the concise Hebrew story form the confluence of Jewish and Hellenistic influences to be found in Palestine during the first century CE.[64]

Brad Young developed several of these strands of argument: despite a style of compilation in the Gospels which differs from that in rabbinic literature, the parables of Jesus are recognizable as early corroboration of the thesis that the story parable was a rhetorical device of first-century Judaism; like

[63] Flusser, *Gleichnisse*, chs. 2 and 9.
[64] Flusser, *Gleichnisse*, chs. 1 and 6.

the rabbinic story parable, Jesus' parables could treat the universal themes of repentance, compassion and forgiveness, human and divine. Young therefore resists the inference that many or most of the parables reflect a process of Christian self-definition. Jesus and the rabbis were at one in employing the parable to set out the far-reaching moral implications of relationships, human and divine.[65]

In a more satisfactory statement of the complex relationship between New Testament and rabbinic parables, the Lucerne school takes account not just of the evident similarities but also of all the other factors relevant to the discussion—history, form, text, tradition, literary criticism and hermeneutics. Clemens Thoma and Simon Lauer saw the need for secure rabbinic texts, translations and commentaries. In their view the full range of texts needs examination. Neither Fiebig with his concentration solely on the Mekilta nor Flusser with his devaluation of the post-120 CE exegetical parables employs a wide enough base.[66] There is, they maintain, an Old Testament precedent for rabbinic and New Testament parables, but no firm formal parabolic structure to be identified there. Hence the failure of scholars to agree on how many passages from the Old Testament should be classified as parables. Where then did parables come from? Not from Stoic–Cynic impulses, from Epicurean narratives where the story level and the meaning level are kept apart, nor from the lowly fable, although these do illustrate the kind of repertoire available for teachers of all kinds and persuasions. Within the rabbinic tradition the parable has its own complicated history, as demonstrated by its changing relationship to scriptural exegesis, to halakah and haggadah, and to homiletics. So a proper and exact method of comparison between all the different kinds of parables, Old Testament, New Testament and rabbinic parables included, is no easy matter. To avoid the apologetically based value judgments of previous parable research requires much more work on the texts and on the history of the texts.[67] The Lucerne group is active in making available this kind of material so that comparative

---

[65] Young, *Parables*, 317-320.

[66] Thoma, *Gleichnisse*, is not committed to a specific number of Old Testament parables (see Westermann, *Gleichnisse*). Thoma notes the Epictetus parables as background to both rabbinic and New Testament parables and concludes: 'Ohne Kenntnis der rabbinischen Gleichnisse gibt daher kein volles Verständnis rabbinischer Ausdruckweise, Ethik, Identität, Halacha, Haggada, Liturgiegeschichte und Theologie' (55). This is a useful context in which to evaluate Goulder's work. Goulder, *Midrash*, 47-69, suggests that all the Old Testament, rabbinic parables and all but one of the Matthean parables are indicative parables; they point to a situation that is, or in the case of the rabbinic and Matthean parables to the perspective of God's activity (see Westermann, *Parables*, 164-171).

[67] Thoma, *Story*, 38.

material and analytical tools can be available for the detailed examination of the Matthean parables, as we shall see later in this study. One point is, however, clear from the work of the Lucerne group. They see the narrative parable as a feature of the communication process during the first century CE. To define precisely what a parable is remains problematic, since communication served such different purposes then, as now. In rabbinism it served a powerful and long-standing tradition. In the New Testament it served the specific context of the teaching of Jesus. There, as we shall see, the concept of communication, although in some ways appropriate, does not do justice to certain features of the Jesus tradition.

The new resources of rabbinic scholarship and a fresh insistence on the compositional function of the Gospel parables have made possible an important further step forward. Recently a distinguished scholar acidly concluded that the massive work of Peter Dschulnigg[68] had contributed nothing to the understanding of the Gospel parables because of the lateness of the sources used. In fact Dschulnigg's bringing together of rabbinic and Gospel resources has resulted in some extremely significant findings: in particular he has highlighted the persistence, over against what he finds in the rabbinic parables, of the interplay between the levels of narration and reference in the Gospel parables; in the Gospel parables the influence of the narrative is not finished when the story finishes. This interplay of narrative and reference levels is not characteristic of the Pesiqta parables; once the point of reference is reached, the story is forgotten. In the Pesiqta the strength of the referential aspect often weakens the role of the narration, even in the case of the double and multiple parables. These latter have similarities with the multiple parables of the synoptic tradition. Multiple parables are mutually interactive in both the Pesiqta and the Gospels, and we shall explore this insight in relation to the Matthean parabolic groupings.[69] But the persistent character of the narration in the synoptic parables is remarkable, rendering their interpretation richly rewarding, if highly complex. Their general, sometimes open-ended, introductions and their metaphorical networks make recourse back to the narrative detail of the Gospel parables illuminating and stimulating. The result is, according to Dschulnigg, an important insight into the nature of the parabolic corpus as a whole.

Dschulnigg has established ground rules for comparing and contrasting the Pesiqta parables and the Gospel material, and this is a measure of his success. What he has failed to do is to fulfil his declared intention to study the compositional function of the synoptic parables. The function, type and

---

[68] Dschulnigg, *Gleichnisse, Kind.*

[69] See Steinhauser, *Doppelbildworte*; Anderson, *Stories.*

content of the parables as they appear in the synoptic texts require a more thorough investigation. It will become apparent in Part Two of this book that the parables do not fit as easily and neatly into a single pattern of teaching as Dschulnigg suggests. They represent different lines of development and thought; in their present form they emerge from different homes, rather than from a single cradle of integrated teaching.

In conclusion to this section, we have to admit that source-critical work has not been able to identify the nature of the parable. We have not been able to find a definitive point of reference for all the parables. Indeed one of the more important findings to have emerged from this area of work is that to isolate any single point of reference in the history of parables as definitive for the evaluation of all parables is probably mistaken. Source criticism can do little more than set the parables alongside a rich and varied means of communication within which Hellenistic as well as Jewish elements have a place.

Second, the character and setting of the parable can be examined by means of four pieces of form-critical work on the parables. The first places the synoptic parables in the context of the Old Testament and intertestamental material and attempts a classical form-critical investigation of that material. Claus Westermann takes a functional view of parables and sees dialogue as the context of a parable. He establishes the important principle that figurative Old Testament language belongs within the context of proverbs, prophecy and psalmody rather than in narrative and law. Within those dialogical contexts its intensifying function claims a hearing for what is said and for each part of what is said. It is used of events in history, and employs the significance of the created order to give weight specifically to the dialogue between human beings and God. To the extent that parables are extensions of such 'comparisons' the same is true of parables also.[70]

Turning to the New Testament parables, Westermann distinguishes between parables of proclamation and parables of action. His analysis is made according to their wording, not their interpretation. He works with a fourfold classification, without claiming that this includes all parables. The four are:

I Stories involving sudden change: parables of proclamation.
II Parables of growth.
III Announcement of judgment.
IV Instruction for: (a) present action, or (b) future action.

The purpose of the classification is not completeness. It is to note their themes and illustrate the different functions of the parables in their different contexts.

---

[70] Westermann, *Parables*.

The analysis is useful, but the functions which Westermann describes are part of a larger prophetic complex. That complex involves words, acts, history, audience, subsequent record, and above all the belief that in that complex divine activity could be recognized. The communication process is based primarily on an understanding of God's relationship to humanity. Parables and prophetic sayings cannot be understood in isolation from that context; they cannot be understood apart from a complex which places prophetic work in the reality of what God initiates.[71] That context of prophetic work will be considered in greater detail, but the detail belongs to the conclusion of this section on form criticism rather than to its beginning. At this stage we are concerned with Westermann's use of the classical form-critical method on the parabolic material and his placing of figurative material within the prophetic, wisdom and psalmodic context.

What is the status of classical form-critical work when applied to the parables? Can it assist in the defining of a parable? The question of the status of form-critical findings is never easy to answer, and that is particularly true in form-critical studies of the parables. The status of form-critical work depends in part on the kind of classifications which are possible and on the interpretation given to the classifications; it depends on the feasibility of the three forms of analysis: synchronic, diachronic and functional.

In the case of the Psalms it is evident that there are structures whose subsections are in consistent sequences and are demarcated by recurrent vocabulary and syntax. They are ideal material for synchronic analysis. The structures also belong to a genre from which there are striking comparative parallels in extra-biblical sources. Diachronic analysis is consequently highly illuminating. Providing that the setting of the Psalms is understood to be worship, individual and corporate, the content of the different structures can be given summary interpretations for which the biblical descriptions of worship provide matching settings. So functional aspects, social, religious and existential, are all well attested. In all those respects the form-critical work on the Psalms can attract a high degree of general consent. A similar case can be made in relation to form-critical work on the Gospel miracles, providing, as Theissen insists, that the analysis is deepened by stressing the network of relationships within the texts.[72]

In the case of the parables the situation is somewhat different. The vocabulary and syntactical material is not so consistently available across the different sources, despite the fact that rabbinic and Gospel material share common themes, and it is difficult to find matching settings in the biblical

[71] Stacey, *Prophetic Drama*, 280.
[72] Theissen, *Miracle Stories*.

material for any but a few of the parables. Diachronic analysis is made extremely difficult because of the problems which we have just noted in dating the mass of sources whose texts are only now becoming available in fully annotated forms. So it is not surprising that form critics differ in the descriptions which they give to parabolic forms. For example, to which category does Mt 25:31-46 belong, if it is a parable at all? Westermann is only able to give a specific classification to parts of the parable. It is difficult enough in Psalm criticism to classify one part of a text differently from another; in the parables the difficulty is increased several-fold. The first of the three subsections of *The Unforgiving Servant* is classified by Westermann as a 'parable' of proclamation. In the case of the Psalms their tradition history makes the classification of a part of the Psalm intelligible. That is not with any certainty the case with the parables. Furthermore parabolic texts invite inconsistencies from form critics: the classifications are technicaliy required to be independent of the act of interpretation; but the classification of the parable of *The Sheep* as 'proclamation' depends on its correspondence to a precise context in the ministry of Jesus, and that correspondence is only clear when the parable's central metaphor is given a specific interpretation.[73]

This discussion of the status of form-critical analysis of the parables can usefully be continued in relation to Bultmann's work. Bultmann is dealing with sayings in the Old and New Testaments, distinguishing the grammatical mood of the sentence from any ornamental characteristics. Using the Jewish mashal as his starting-point, he notes any possible signs of adaptation or expansion of sayings, whether through repetition of structure or through illustration or via some other means. Bultmann then turns from the syntactical to the ornamental, and comments again on the sayings tradition. This time he views the tradition from the point of view of its pictorial uniformity, approached again via the Hebrew mashal.[74] The mashal used down-to-earth detail as its main means of expression, and that feature is shared with many of the New Testament logia. Mt 5:45, for example, speaks of divine goodness, using the picture of sun and rain; the sun and rain are available to all, good and bad alike.

This starting-point differentiates Bultmann's work from Jülicher's approach to the parables, and it is a point of which Westermann is critical. Bultmann is interested in the pictorial factor. He does not appear to be interested in clear-cut categories of formal analysis. Westermann sees clarity of analysis as all-important and sees functional analysis as the only way to seek it. Bultmann's approach is much more nuanced. He reviews the

---

[73] Westermann, *Parables*, 184.

[74] Bultmann, *Geschichte*, 84ff, 179ff.

material which he analysed syntactically, noting its concrete imagery, how this is intensified via hyperbole and paradox, how different kinds of comparison and pictorial imagery appear (*Vergleiche und Bilder*: e.g. Mt 3:10; 5:14; 24:28, or in an expanded form Lk 6:39), and how the presence or absence of application affects the sense of the saying and the way in which its imagery can be grasped. In particular, when he includes examples of pictorial imagery, he recognizes that it is often redactional activity which gives the imagery its metaphorical form (Mt 5:13,14,16).[75] Extended pictorial imagery or comparisons give us the 'Similitudes' (*Gleichnisse*).[76] From there on he follows Jülicher's categories: figurative material (*Gleichnisse*), parables in the strict sense (*Parabeln*) and example stories (*Beispielerzählungen*).[77]

Westermann and Bultmann enable us to recognize the role of the figurative material in the Gospels; figurative material promotes dialogue and with down-to-earth pictures intensifies and sharpens the conversation. But tight argumentation and exclusive categorization of the parabolic material do not suit the variety of the biblical imagery. In that respect Bultmann's method is preferable. Bultmann's contribution, in addition to his stress on the mashal, is in a suggestive reading of the texts which enables him to point to possible tendencies in the tradition. Aware of the subtle movements which take place as imagery, syntax and contexts change, Bultmann provided a model for all form and redaction critics of the parables to follow. He was mistaken in his assumption that simple, pure forms are early and complex forms are late; but that simply reinforces the importance of keeping the text as a constant reference point.

If Bultmann's method is helpful in establishing some basic principles of form-critical work on the parables, it fails to deal with several aspects of the forms in the texts themselves. The third contributor to the form-critical discussion, Klaus Berger, draws our attention to aspects of the parabolic texts which need attention but which are not covered by Bultmann's method. These are the forms in the texts themselves. In his classification of them Berger prefers the ancient triple rhetorical distinctions: the forms are

[75] Bultmann, *Geschichte*, 183.

[76] Bultmann, *Geschichte*, 184.

[77] 'Example Narratives' have been widely discussed; see Baasland, *Formenlehre*. Baasland concludes that Lk 10:30-37, 12:16-21, 14:16-24, 15:11-32, 16:19-31 and 18:9-14 have only a relative distinctiveness over against other parables, insufficiently so to be classified as an independent Gattung. Of these, Heininger, *Metaphorik*, regards 10:30-37, 16:19-31 and 18:9-14 primarily as stories presenting, through a focus on a particular case, the consequences of a world radically adjusted to the Kingdom (rather than, as the *Parabeln* do, proclaiming the Kingdom). If Heininger's distinction is not accepted, and in our view it should not be, Baasland's case stands.

concerned with changing the hearer by a rhetoric which is Advisory (provoking a person to action), Display (moving a person through a presentation) or Forensic (leading a person towards making a decision).[78] Since any New Testament texts which involve analogies or imagery may serve any of those three divisions, Berger classifies the texts under the general heading of Collected Forms.

Berger sets himself an achievable target. He concentrates particularly on the synchronic, limiting himself to the text in front of him, and not attempting to move into the oral period behind the text. This has great advantages and encourages a detailed analysis of many different forms. His classification is fourfold:

1. *Descriptio: Parables in the Narrower Sense*

Some describe the absurd, e.g. 1 Cor 9:7; Lk 14:31; Mt 6:27 par; 7:9; 12:11; 18:12-13 par. They are advisory in context and are separable into those with parallels in Jewish Wisdom literature, such as the Matthean material just cited, and those which have parallels in popular Hellenistic material, e.g. Philo, *De Prov* II 7, *De Plant* 175, and introductory phrases such as 'Who among you...?' (Epictetus, *Diss* I:27:15-21; see also *Apocalypse of Elijah* 1:23). Especially in the latter form, these synoptic parables have an argumentative and multifunctional character within a community setting.

Other examples describe normality, using a single sentence structure (Mt 25:29; as a riddle in Lk 23:31) or using narrative features, as in Mt 7:24-27, Mt 11:16-17 par, Mk 3:28f, Mk 4:1-9 par, Mk 4:26-29, Mt 18:4 and Mt 13:33-52. They evidence a clear relationship to the emotions of the hearers (joy in Mt 18:14; fear in Mt 7:24-27); they deal with judgment or separation, contrasts such as apocalyptic material uses. They have a decisively Jewish background (Mt 7:24-27; James 1:23f; however, Lk 13:6-9 is Hellenistic). Some similitudes are concluded by or are associated with maxims. Some maxims function as similitudes within particular contexts.

2. *Narratio*

These have a narrative form (among the Matthean examples are Mt 20:1-16; 25:14-30; 22:1-14; 25:1-13; 21:28-32; 18:23-25; among the Lucan are Lk 18:9-14; 18:1-8; 10:30-37; 12:16-21; 14:16-24; 15:11-32; 16:19-31). They

[78] Berger, *Formgeschichte*, 16-18.

often have authoritarian dramatis personae; they are sometimes parallel to the Hellenistic declamatio; they register a decision or require a decision (as in 2 Sam 12:1-7). This gives them a relevance to community relationships. They have the short, fictional character of the Hellenistic narratio, resembling the fable in this and its argumentative function, whether hortatory or advisory. They also add, by way of commentary, and perhaps to a greater extent than is true of non-New Testament texts, a concluding reference to the area of concern addressed in the story; and they have a close relation to the argument of the context to which they belong, as a conclusion, an example, or a definition.

3. *Discursio*

Here parabolic material has entered a distinctively new form (see Mt 24:30–25:30 and 1 Cor 5:6b-8). It concerns figurative material relevant to the interim period before the coming of the Lord. Alternative cases and possibilities are envisaged; only in this classification among the parables are beatitudes added; the group may conclude with a peroratio. Typical of the form is the use of rhetorical questions and imperatival interruptions. It appears to have developed, perhaps late in the tradition, to explore within the Christian community the relation of ethics and eschatology.

4. *Allegoria*

This is a specific way of relating two texts: there is the original text and there is that which interprets it in relation to a fresh situation. The resultant metaphors are identifiable only by those 'in the know' but are in an unusual association. The writer alone may be responsible as in Rev 5:6,8 etc.; a revealer may explain the picture as in Rev 21:1ff; or a dialogue between revealer and receiver may result in an interpretation which offers many points of explanation. This may concern a Christological interpretation of a vision; or in the case of Mk 4:10-12 an ecclesiological interpretation of the parable, interpreting the text for a self-conscious minority; or a heavenly journey where word and symbol interact.

Berger stresses the many similarities which exist between the Epistles and the Gospels in terms both of forms and genre, and between the Gospels and Jewish and Hellenistic literary texts.[79] One issue concerns the appropriateness of such comparative analysis. With respect to the rhetorical

[79] Berger, *Formgeschichte*, 373-375.

character of the Epistles the suitability of oratorical analysis for the latter genre has been questioned.[80] Uncertainty in the case of the Epistles must give way in the case of the Gospels to real anxiety. The similarities between the Epistles and Gospels are evident, but it is important to monitor carefully the degree of persuasion present in the Matthean material. The word 'rhetoric' needs to be understood in its most general literary sense, and there are indications that Berger intends that.

There is much to be gained from this approach. Berger's case is particularly strong in the first section of the *Descriptio* group. Arguments drawn from biblical and non-biblical parallels, recurrent vocabulary, syntax and motifs—all suggest a common form. To this form belong Mt 6:27; 7:9-10=Lk 11:11-12; Mt 12:11; Lk 11:5-8; Lk 14:28-30; Mt 18:12-13=Lk 15:4-6, some of which have a single and some a double format. Biblical and non-biblical parallels confirm that this is a widely used form of communication. Berger does not draw the likely conclusion that the form could go back behind the written Gospels, since his concern is to identify the rhetorical forms in the text. But he would surely be justified in doing so, in the limited degree to which he allows himself that luxury.[81] The spread of the form across the traditions is further encouragement to the view that this is a pre-Gospel feature of the parabolic material.

But there are problems with Berger's first group: is there a correlation between form and function? Only by stretching and switching the three rhetorical categories can Berger make his theory approximate to the bewilderingly complex usage to be found across the material designated for this group. As Berger recognizes, contexts promote major shifts of usage and only the roughest of generalizations are possible.

The central question regarding the *Descriptio* section is whether or not Berger's method does justice to the actual text. There are two key examples in his treatment of this group, where it can be argued that Berger has identified a parabolic feature but not done justice to the actual form as it appears in the text. In the case of the parable of *The Sheep*, nowhere is the issue faced that the actual text of the Matthean form is apothegmatic, and apparently apothegmatic at Matthean and pre-Matthean stages (see the parallel in the *Apocalypse of Elijah* 1:23-27).[82] In the case of Mt 7:24-27, cited five times in the discussion, nowhere is the actual form of the Matthean text noted.[83] Nor is the function of 7:24-27 mentioned, although in the *Narratio* section similar summary functions are noted.

---

[80] Hughes, *Rhetoric*.
[81] Berger, *Formgeschichte*, 13.
[82] Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 32-34.
[83] Johnston, *Parables*, 353-358.

It is evident from this observation that Berger's argument is based on selected features of the text, and that his selection is governed by rhetorical categories. The particular parabolic feature which is central to the *Descriptio* section is well attested in literature. But it would be a petitio principii to assume that it is a literary feature and nothing more. It could well be argued that it reflects immediate, oral communication rather than communication via a written form.

Berger's *Narratio* section finds similarities between the narrative parables and the fable. These parables are found in several levels of the synoptic material and represent the range of parabolic material where the narrative element, as distinct from the traditional pattern within rabbinic material, has a significance which persists beyond the end of the story. Berger is right to note the integration of these stories with the immediate literary contexts in which they appear. They are built into the Gospel contexts and are part of the Gospel's literary strategy. Whether this actually means, as Berger assumes, that they function with relatively less autonomy as narratives because of their integration into specific contexts is to be considered in the individual treatment of each parable.[84] Integration into a context does not necessarily mean that the narrative cannot also present an area of freedom for reflection and response. That is particularly so when, as Berger indicates, the subjects which these parables address are as complicated as wealth, mercy, perseverance, and the justification of a place in the Kingdom for sinners and Gentiles.

The question of the autonomy of narrative parables belongs with the observation that their background is in the ancient fable. The style and brevity of the fable suggest that its narrative may be subordinate to a particular argument. It is directed, so it is often assumed, to the making of a particular point. But that is not altogether true either of the fable or of the parables which resemble the fable. The fable often requires the reader to pay attention to the tension between the final maxim and the narrative.[85] The Gospel parallels require an even greater attention to that tension, since their structure and style can change during the course of the narrative; it can begin in a fable-like style, and then continue in a different style. The classic illustration from the material designated *Narratio* by Berger is Mt 18:23-35, where the style of the third act of the parable is not consistent with the first two acts. The question of the autonomy of these parables has to be considered later in more detail.

Section 3, *Discursio*, makes room for material which promotes discursive thought. It is not clear why the verses in Mt 24:30–25:30 are specified in

[84] Berger, *Formgeschichte*, 53.
[85] *Cor Fab Aesop* I.1.15b.

isolation from 25:31-46, but the recognition that parabolic material may assist reflection on eschatology and ethics modifies the emphasis on primarily directive categories. This is one of the indications as to how Berger understands the rhetorical genre.

So far in the review of parabolic form criticism three significant factors have emerged: the variety of the figurative material makes classification of forms tentative, the importance of the mashal, and the role of the parabolic texts as they appear in the written Gospels. Drury, a fourth contributor to this area of research, builds on those three features of parabolic form criticism and links them with observations on the prophetic context and its development in apocalyptic material.[86] He cites a number of examples of mashal (1 Sam 10:9-13; Ezek 17, 12:22; Isa 14:4; Num 23-24) and describes them as distillations of historical experience in a compact instance. He traces this historical interest through the use made of figurative material in Daniel (2:49), in intertestamental material (2 Esdr 4:13-18) and in the Early Church (Gal 4:21-31), suggesting that the synoptic parables as they appear in the Gospel texts can be illuminated by a historical perspective. The parables, like the prophetic oracles, are part of a pattern through which the divine events in history are recognized.

Drury gives a central place in his discussion of Old Testament parables to the figurative material in Ezekiel. He describes the material as comprising 'complex allegories with a determinative historical context'. In this respect Ezekiel, Drury argues, is the father of the commonest kind of parable in the Gospels, 'the allegorical historical parable'. The 'allegorical historical parable' takes many forms, but it is essentially an imaginative use of figurative language in relation to a specific historical setting. In Ezekiel 17 the prophet binds disconnected narrative features into a sharp political comment on the international politics of his time. Such an allegory can 'become deed', as in 24:3 when Ezekiel cooks meat in a rusty pot representing Jerusalem. Similarly in Mk 12:1-10 history is the subject of the allegory, as it is the subject of other smaller parables in Mark (Mk 2:21f) and the 'end of history' parables in Mk 13.

Despite the exaggeratory claim that this represents the commonest form of synoptic parable and despite the confusing use of the word 'allegory', Drury's use of prophetic parallels to the synoptic parables has much to commend it. Its chief weakness is a failure to set those parallels in an adequate prophetic background and to find an appropriate terminology for that background. To describe allegories as a concatenation of symbolic persons, places, things and happenings signifying a parallel concatenation in

---

[86] Drury, *Parables*; see Wright, *People*, 433-434. For an example where Ezekiel provides a close parallel to the synoptic parables but where the Matthean parable is not an 'historical allegory', see pp.342f.

the actual world, even given a univocal approach to symbolism, is to use a sophisticated terminology from today's culture without enquiring if it is suitable for the ancient prophetic culture. To speak of 'allegories becoming deed' is also a step away from the self-understanding of a Hebrew prophet. A different world requires its own distinctive terminology.

The most important attempt to find such a terminology is Stacey's discussion of prophetic drama. Three areas of that study are relevant here. First, when considering an Old Testament prophetic book, five different kinds of people have to be considered: there is the prophet acting under a sense of divine compulsion; there is the uncomprehending Hebrew onlooker; there are the prophet's disciples, selecting and making the first record of the prophet's work; there are the theologically sophisticated editors of the prophetic text; there are the believing commentators who interpreted the prophet's work in terms of the whole canon. Second, when considering Old Testament prophecy, it is the divine event that is central to the prophet's work. Yahweh is constantly at work in history and the prophet's role is to signify this. That reality of the divine event has its existence in various guises: as the will of Yahweh, in the mind of the prophet, in the prophetic oracle, in his dramatic acts, in the arena of history, and in the historical record. How these are related to each other is less important than the way in which each can be known as a manifestation of the divine reality. So, for example, the Fall of Jerusalem can be a divine act, a prophetic oracle, a flask broken before the elders, an actual horror, a series of actions, and a bitter record. The consequence for parabolic research of such a view of Old Testament prophecy is that the oracles, parables and apocalyptic visions are manifestations of the divine power and will, mirroring, representing, interpreting, heightening and revealing its true nature. Third, in the context of Old Testament prophecy the time factor resembles the complicated interrelation of past, present and future, of prediction and fulfilment, of cause and effect experienced in worship. Those three areas of study illuminate the distinctiveness of prophecy: word, record and fulfilment are related to the central divine reality and are expressions of that reality.[87] With that clarification of the classical prophet's role the relationship of parable and action in the life of Jesus can be investigated afresh.

We summarize our findings so far. The synchronic material from rabbinic and Hellenistic sources with parallel groupings of motifs and similar presentations of plot and character, and the diachronic material especially in the Old Testament and intertestamental material, used alongside a pattern of prophetic action identified as word, act, record, fulfilment and event, show that the parabolic form is a distinctive form of utterance. Implied in these

[87] See the reference to Stacey, *Prophetic Drama*, on p.86.

findings are two recommendations for the study of the parables: the text and literary context of the parables are to be a main area of enquiry; and it would be inadvisable to study only one kind of parable, or the parables in isolation from their contexts. All Matthean imagery, aphorisms and narrative fictions are relevant to the study and the discussion of the Matthean parables. Without them the Matthean perspective on the parables would be incomplete.

The third way of studying the parables, the redaction-critical method, can also contribute to our search for a definition of the parable. There are some who argue that the study of parables should be limited or guided by the redactional usage of the word παραβολή in the Gospels. This would significantly reduce the range of our enquiry. In Mark this would mean that the range of study would be much more limited than that of the mashal. It would include only the small fictional narratives of Mk 4, a proverb (Mk 3:23), a riddle (Mk 7:14-23), a kind of 'object lesson' (Mk 13:28) and the extended fiction in ch. 12:1ff. Some regard this evidence as crucial. B. Scott follows Kelber in regarding as determinative for the interpretation of the Gospel as a whole the parable as defined in 4:11: the parable 'determines those inside and outside'.[88] Similar arguments have been presented in the case of Luke.[89] It is worth presenting the comparable findings for Matthew's Gospel too: the distribution of παραβολή in Matthew is well within the range occupied by the word in Mark. The statistics for παραβολή are:

Mt	17x	These occur in chs. 13, 15, 21-22 and 24.			
		ch. 13	12x		
				6x	Par Mk; 3x No Par; 1x Diff Lk;
				1x	Diff Mk or Par Mk; 1x Diff Mk/No Par.
		ch. 15	1x	Par	Mk (Mt 15:15=Mk 7:17)
		chs. 21-22	3x	2x	Par Mk (uMt 21:33,45//Mk 12:1,12);
				1x	Diff Lk (Mt 22:1 *The Feast*);
		ch. 24	1x	Par	Mk (Mt 24:32=Mk 13:28).
Mk	13x			10x	Par Mt; > 2x; ? 1x.[90]
Lk	19x			9x	No Par; 7x Par Mk;
				1x	Diff Mk; 2x Diff Mt.

Elsewhere: Heb 9:9; 11:19.

Luke uses παραβολή of a Proverb at 4:23, 5:36 and 6:13, of a warning at 12:41, and of fictional narratives where the word sometimes accompanies an

[88] Scott, *Parable*, 25.
[89] Heininger, *Metaphorik*, 6.
[90] For the meaning of these symbols, see pp.11-12.

introduction (4x) or a saying (3x). To restrict our study to the uses of παραβολή would be to meet with internal contradictions (see Mt 18:12-14/Lk 15:3; Mt 22:1-14/Lk 14:16-24) and with external contradictions (see the Yohanan ben Zakkai parallel).

A further factor in the discussion is introduced by the use of παραβολή in Mk 4 par. These passages contain a great deal of material relevant to the defining of a parable and a full discussion of them must be reserved for Part Two. But significant for our discussion is that each of the Gospel writers linked παραβολή with μυστήριον (Mt 13:11; Mk 4:11; Lk 8:10) and with the Isaiah quotation (Mt 13:14-15; Mk 4:12; Lk 8:10); the definition of a parable cannot adequately take place apart from those redactional considerations. What each Gospel writer understood a parable to be is an essential element in the attempt to define it. A parable cannot be defined in terms of a historical moment behind the Gospels; it belongs to the presentation of the good news in the Gospels and our definition must take account of that. We can summarize as follows: the function of Mk 4 was encouraging, exhorting, warning, reminding the readers of their responsibilities, warning them of the dangers which may attack their faith, pointing them to new stages of that faith, and assuring them of the glorious future which is promised to them.[91] The parables play an important role in that presentation and are seen to be part of the pattern by which so many hear, some make such varied responses, and some fail to understand at all. How that could be part of the divine purpose is one of the problems with which Mark wrestles.[92] In so far as the parables are a means of communication, they are properly recognized to be part of the problem. Mt 13 heightens the problem. In Matthew 13 there a contrast between the privilege and the potential failure of discipleship. To know what is revealed through God's Son, even to know it hesitatingly and incompletely, is to be aware of what the Kingdom means; but it is also to be aware of the seriousness of the call to repentance. It is a warning to faithful and unfaithful, that all live in the light of God's judgment. The parables are involved in that message. Luke's call to perseverance in discipleship is a key to the understanding of the parabolic message in that Gospel.[93] The Lucan parables point the way of discipleship, illuminate and illustrate it, and emphasize the struggle and promise which the way involves. These three synoptic passages show that it is impossible to do justice to the definition of a parable without the insights which come from the redactional perspective.[94]

---

[91] Tuckett, *Concerns*.
[92] Hooker, *Mark*; Marcus, *Epistemology*.
[93] Brown, *Perseverance*, 48-50.
[94] For a further discussion of this issue, see pp.298ff.

An important contribution from this perspective is Erlemann's theological analysis of the Matthean parables. Erlemann[95] studied under Berger and his work extends the insights of Berger and Weinrich to answer the question: what did the parables, in particular the Matthean and Lucan parables, say about God, or rather, what did the Gospel writers register in the parable concerning experience with God? How does the imagery of the parables relate to religious language? How do they relate to traditional imagery, particularly that of the Old Testament?

Most attempts to answer these questions from the parables have simply expounded the roles ascribed to God, as Hoffmann did, or have treated the parables as part of a Christian history of ideas, as Aulen did. Alternatively, like Harnisch, they have stressed the performative function of parables, making them into a kerygmatic event; they are to be seen as the Gospel brought to speech. With the reinstatement by Klauck and Berger of allegory as a legitimate means of parabolic interpretation and the reaffirmation of their character as direct communication, fresh answers to the theological questions become possible. Following Weinrich, Erlemann recognizes a multiple intermeshing between the elements of the story and the elements of the situation to which the story leads. That feature of the parables opens the way for a newly structured method of parabolic interpretation in which what is said about the experience of God can be systematically researched.

Such a method has, according to Erlemann, four stages: identifying the parable's purpose and its thematic unity, the literary and historical context of the divine imagery, the function of the divine imagery, and the theological background to which it belongs. This unravels the multiple metaphors of the Matthean and Lucan parables. In the Matthean material there are the commercial metaphors, owner and householder, which lend themselves to an exploration of the depth in everyday morality for Jew and for Gentile; there are also the royal metaphors, king, ruler, host and judge, with the implied factors of time, travel and return in their narratives, which offer an eschatological viewpoint, pointing to the end of time as the ultimate justification for how we are to behave in the interim. In this way the innovative power of the imagery used of God impinges on the changes of behaviour and attitude appropriate to the Kingdom of Heaven. Its power and creativity derive from the community circumstances in which the narrative parables were set. The problems of wealth, racism and religious identity lent the imagery immense power.

The friendlier disposition of the Lucan metaphors also had its links with the community situation. Their basic alignment is, according to Erlemann, with the neighbouring Jewish circles and seeks to achieve a right use of

---

[95] Erlemann, *Gottesbild*; *Gleichnissen.*

property especially among the more wealthy Jewish Christians. The problems of Jew and Gentile interlock in the Lucan community, with the contrast between rich and poor, and the disadvantaged position of the Gentiles over against their wealthy neighbours. God welcomes sinners (Lk 14,15); imagery which announces that welcome takes prominence. The judgmental aspects recede, until in Lk 19 the issue becomes that of the recognition of Jesus. Whereas the earlier parables in Luke courted the hearers, from Luke 19 onward the Gospel finally indicates what is decisive for adherence to the community of salvation: Judgment is the consequence of failing to recognize Jesus as King.

So, argues Erlemann, in both Matthew and Luke God is not abstractly conceived. The language is situational. The immediate situations are addressed by what is said of God, the integration of imagery and context being effected above all through the melting together of the divine and the Son of Man/Christ imagery.

The attempt to evaluate the parables theologically is a significant part of the interpreter's task, and Erlemann's fulfilment of that task is perceptive and critically alert. Reference will be made in Part Two to his work on individual parables. There are however two issues relevant to the definition of a parable which his treatment raises. The intermeshing of narrative parables and the social context to which they were addressed needs a more dynamic model. The narratives were open to different parts of the Matthean community and different social levels within the community would have responded in different ways; slaves would have responded differently from landowners and city officials.[96] Second, the emblematic metaphors taken together are not only reflections on the experience of God; according to the definition of metaphor which we have preferred they are suggestive of the transcendent level of Matthew's concerns,[97] a level which corresponds to the prophetic context to which the parables belong.

So a theological factor needs to be incorporated in the definition of a parable, and the final part of this chapter will examine further ways in which that can be attempted. Ricoeur's definition of the parable provides a starting-point. To define a parable, first, we are to understand the probing of moral attitudes and the building of fresh perspectives through parabolic language. We can probe moral attitudes and build fresh perspectives because rooted in language is a potential for interpersonal and intrapersonal dialogue[98] such that metaphor becomes the language of hope, and narrative the imaginative exploration of human possibilities. It is not for the philosopher to provide the grounds for this rooting in language of the potential for dialogue, so

[96] See pp.160-161.
[97] See pp.245ff.
[98] Ricoeur, *Soi-même*.

Ricoeur judges, although in his work on biblical hermeneutics he provides the counterpoints between the philosopher's virtues of solicitude and the theologian's grace, hope and love.[99]

Ricoeur's definition of a parable is in terms, second, of the manifestation function of religious language.[100] The parables, thanks to their extravagance, disclose the religious or sacred dimension of human life. They are a mode of discourse which applies to a narrative form a metaphoric process; and that definition conveys in technical language the spontaneous conviction of the reader that she/he has to do at one and the same time with a freely created story and with the transfer of meaning which does not affect just this or that part of the story but the narrative as a whole, and which becomes in that way a fiction capable of redescribing life.[101]

And, third, according to Ricoeur a parable represents the distinctive world-view of Jesus, although the ultimate referent of the parable is not the Kingdom of God but human reality in its wholeness. The Gospel parables, and with them the Gospel narratives, disclose a world already graced and a mode of human being that corresponds to that world. From a point of view of affirmation and trust and the goodness of Being, Ricoeur recognized the goodness of Being as reaching its decisive event in Jesus Christ. It is that which finds expression in the parable.[102]

That analysis illustrates in itself the difficulty of defining adequately what a parable is and how it functions. It is an analysis which raises the crucial problems of why they should hold a central place within Christian teaching and preaching, and whether it is necessary to identify their original intention and meaning. It also helps us to identify how it is that the parables function as objects of universal human interest and specifically as affirmations of hope. Ricoeur is of course perilously close to a position where the literal meaning of a metaphorical utterance is considered false and the metaphorical sense is considered true. As we saw earlier, that is a position which the Gospel writer Matthew would oppose. One way in which the Kingdom of Heaven is important is because of what it must mean within our human society and relationships. The acts of mercy, love and faith appropriate to the parables belong in and with the world.

Ricoeur's view that the reader has to do at one and the same time with a freely created story and with a transfer of meaning which affects the narrative as a whole extends to the wider relationship of parable and Gospel. We have to interpret the insertion of the parable in the Gospel form as part of its

---

[99] Ricoeur, *Hermeneutics*, 131; Vanhoozer, *Philosophy*, ch. 10; Lambrecht, *Once More Astonished.*

[100] Ricoeur, *Metaphor*, ch. 3.

[101] Ricoeur, *Hermeneutics*, 93-106; Vanhoozer, *Philosophy*, 96-99.

[102] Ricoeur, *Hermeneutics*, 136-144; Vanhoozer, *Philosophy*, 136ff, ch. 9.

meaning for us. We understand the parable with the help of the written Gospel; we also understand it, as Ricoeur maintains, against the distortions of the Gospel. Ricoeur examines Freudian categories as tools of suspicion and criticism, noting the danger of projecting our wishes onto the Gospel, and maintaining that symbol, narrative and metaphor provide a dimension of transformation in which self-awareness is deepened and broadened.

There are dangers in Ricoeur's approach. Ricoeur shares with the theologians of the New Hermeneutics, especially Ebeling and Fuchs, an interest in the parables as a language event, as presenting the reader with an opportunity to see life and the world in a new way. His interest is in the meaning–effect of symbol, metaphor and narrative in relation to human possibilities. One result of that emphasis on meaning–effect is an attenuation of the critical method by which fact and fiction in relation to the life of Jesus may be distinguished. Behind that attenuation of critical method lies an assimilation of the paradigm of historical enquiry into a paradigm of literary construction. As Thiselton expresses it, we are trapped within an intralinguistic world in which the traditional notion of 'reference' has been transposed into an internal relation within a phenomenological system.[103] Nevertheless Ricoeur's insistence on holding the balance between parabolic narrative and Gospel, so that one is seen as corrective of the other, deserves further examination.

Assuming for the moment that the 'parable' is a distinctive form of speech, what can be said about the relationship of the parable to the Gospel? Can the 'parable' act as a safeguard for the Gospel? Has it a distinctive function to perform within the Gospel corpus? There are several ways of arguing that case. One is the possibility that the genre of the Gospel owes its existence to the transforming effect of parable on the biography genre:[104] the parable as the form most closely associated with Jesus and as a sign of the Kingdom was fused with the common Graeco-Roman biography genre to produce the Gospel of Mark; the parable fused with the Egyptian-Syrian Wisdom collection to produce the Gospel of Thomas. In both cases the parable, based on the capability of metaphor to transform meaning, transformed the contemporary genre. The parable generated the Gospel. As a historical judgment the claim is open to serious question. If we assume that Mark is the first Gospel, the first Gospel is that in which the short narrative fiction parable is least evident. The parable occupies a very small space within Mark to exercise such a transformatory role. Judged historically, the claim that the parable created the Gospel is dubious.

---

103 Thiselton, *Hermeneutics*, 360.
104 Williams, *Gospel*.

Another way of presenting the argument is that the Gospel owes its existence to the parable's relation to the Kingdom.[105] It is the Kingdom of God which provides the authentic hermeneutical horizon. The argument has several stages to it: the parable is dependent for its significance on the mysterious reality of the Kingdom; this is how the parables are presented in the Gospels; they are parables of the Kingdom. The Kingdom is however a symbol, a tensive symbol (to quote Perrin's position); that is, a symbol which cannot be expressed by any one referent; if a symbol is not to remain an entirely mysterious unknown it requires ways in which some of its significance may be explored; that is the task which the parabolic metaphors perform; in performing that task they make known the good news of the Kingdom; they generate the Gospel. However the parables can only generate the Gospel, and they can only explore the nature of the Kingdom, in so far as the Kingdom makes their narrative religious; the parable is dependent for its significance on the mysterious reality of the Kingdom.

This is an intricate argument with many significant features. Three are important for our present discussion: 'Kingdom of God' does not belong to the plane of conceptual abstractions; it has a powerful, transcendental reference with associations through traditional metaphors and myths. A parable is metaphorical process and narrative fiction: it can register a historic challenge to the hearer's world through the shock of metaphor, and persist in time through its relative autonomy as a narrative. The Gospel has, third, a rooting in the historical proclamation of the Kingdom via the living voice of the parable. The parable sustains an authentic hermeneutical horizon.

One of the main difficulties with this approach to a parable is in the claim that a parable retains 'the living voice'.[106] Our argument has been hitherto that source-critical, form-critical and redaction-critical method has shown detailed identification of an authentic tradition to be extremely hazardous. Does not the claim that a particular parable sustains the living voice rest then on highly subjective judgments? Does not one scholar look at a parable from the Gospel of Thomas and judge it to be authentic, while another judges it to be unauthentic? Moreover, to the extent that there is, on the assumptions of this theory, an inevitable element of distortion as a parable is heard in its Gospel context, how is the hearer to distinguish the truth from the distortion, unless it be by some private faculty? If the answer is given that the corpus of parables provides a testimony to the living voice

---

105 Perrin, *Language of the Kingdom.*

106 Scott, *Parable*, 62-65: 'I am looking for the "voice" of the parables. By "voice" I mean those distinct elements in the style of the language. The argument involves an unavoidable circularity. To determine what the distinctive elements of the voice are we must rely initially on scholarship's identification of a core of parables as authentic.'

and this provides a criterion for each separate parable, then we are back to the problem with which redaction criticism has faced us throughout this discussion: the distinctiveness of the form, the structure and theology of the parables in each of the Gospel traditions.[107] Perhaps the central difficulty is provided by the historical context which we have just described, within which the synoptic parables came into being and were in constant use. An authentic 'voice' would only be identifiable (and only then with great difficulty) if the Jesus tradition from start to finish could have been hermetically sealed off from all other influences. Otherwise we are dealing not with a single stock of language but with all the range of narrative languages, available to Jesus, to the narrators and to the hearers. The complex network of influences which we described as characteristic of diachronic research provides a realistic setting for the parables of Jesus, but it also rings the death knell of any attempt to isolate an authentic 'voice'. It means that any parable which is claimed to be a 'performance' of an authentic original could just as easily be the product of a chorus of contributors.

So the fundamental assumption with which this view of the parables operates is flawed, for all the valuable insights that view provides. Jesus proclaimed the Kingdom; his proclamation built new perspectives for those who heard and understood, and parables played a part in that proclamation. But we do not have the parables as and how he told them. We have the parables as part of a network of storytelling and tradition for which the Near East, the Old Testament and the Early Church were all renowned.

Part of the argument which we are rehearsing concerns the nature of narrative and the relationship of narrative to the Gospel genre. The narrative parables are narratives par excellence and narratives have become a centre for hermeneutical and theological enquiry. The reasons for this are many; some are obvious, others are less so. Stories have become important because they democratize theology; they take back theology from the professional and enable anyone who tells their story to participate in the theological process. Stories create community; they are relational, building networks of interest, sympathy and understanding. They are an index of the world-view of any culture.[108] Stories can challenge the world-view of a culture or a religion.[109] They bring together the particular and the universal, so they are ciphers of transcendence, irreducibly about people in relation to the rest of reality. They put us in touch again with lost sensibilities and open our lives again to powers of renewal smothered by modernity.[110] Narratives can expound

[107] See p.93.
[108] Wright, *People*, 215.
[109] Hedrick, *Poetic Fictions*, ch. 5.
[110] Tilley, *Story*.

external history, so that theology can be seen to be rooted in events; they can expound internal history, as the white South African novelist Nadine Gordimer[111] has shown recently. Narrative can explore the nature of God without committing us to a description of God; narrative can depict the character and style of religious responses past and present. The form of narratives enables the narrator and the hearer to share in the story, so that narrated stories become our own as we narrate or hear them. We fill in the gaps in the narrative with our questions, ideas and responses. We respond to the stories and the values they express; and if we recognize in them values which we dispute, we can reconstruct or deconstruct the stories as we retell them.

Important questions arise: how justified is the claim that narratives exhibit the reality to which Christian words and propositions point? One answer is that a word such as 'holiness' is not a shorthand for a narrative, even if that narrative happens to be a key episode in the Old Testament, such as Isaiah 6. The reverse is true: the narrative at every stage of the discussion of 'holiness' has a limited and particular, if rich and dynamic, role. How justified is the claim that theology is narrative because human experience is narrative in form? There are moments of attention, intuition and heightened consciousness which are of incredible density, taking the form of a cognitive and transcendent quality. Not all significant human experience is, in the normal sense of the word, narrative. How justified is the claim that narrative reforms worlds, as Ricoeur claimed it could? As we have seen, literary narrative has the potential to lock humanity within an intertextual world of its own making. How justified is the claim that narrative theology takes us back behind the difficulties caused by the Enlightenment? The African theologian Nyamiti speaks for many when he replies that a mythopoeic theology is unfit for the modern African élite and cannot cope with the problems of the African world. The central question is however whether stories are reliable expressions of faith and belief. When Clement of Alexandria opposed gnostic narratives, was he signalling an unreliability in the genre? It is one of humanity's greatest gifts, through the exercise of imagination and reason to create and explore networks of conceptual thought by which the value of narratives and the suggestiveness of belief can be examined sympathetically but critically.[112] Because of this it is insufficient to consider the role of narrative alone, even narrative alongside symbol and praxis.[113] The conceptual exploration of faith and behaviour deserves attention in the study of the ancient world as in the world

111 Clingman, *Gordimer*.
112 Murdoch, *Metaphysics*.
113 See Wright, *People*.

of today.[114] Conceptual exploration, engaging critically with narrative exploration, is of course capable of self-destruction. That also was true of the ancient world, although not so obviously true as in today's. The search for an ultimate ground, or ultimate grounds, beyond yet constitutive of meaning, occupies the attention of philosopher and theologian alike, and is unlikely to be found in the narrative or in the idea. They both have their part to play; but neither penetrates the ultimate mysteries. For Matthew, as for us, the ultimate is sensed in the history of humanity's pilgrimage with God, the obedience of a people with a vocation, and the conversation which God, despite its apparent impossibility, encourages. It is only within that all-embracing reality that the parables and the proclamation of the Kingdom play their part.

Unfortunately 'story' and 'narrative' no longer carry a simple meaning. In the literary study of the Gospels 'narrative' can include 'discourse' as well as 'actions'. In philosophical discussion 'story' can be any form of discourse which carries a world-view or an organizing focus for living. Such a confusion of normal usage and specialized usage creates problems, setting up particular difficulties for the study of narrative in the Gospels. That is not to say that the specialized use of these words is wrong. The specialized use reflects in some cases the narratological distinction between on the one hand the studied way in which a story is told, with anticipations and flashbacks in its own particular sequence of narration, and on the other the events, characters and actions as perceived in a normal chronological sequence. The distinction is important and relevant to parabolic research. But it is possible that the attempt to see how a whole Gospel moves, to concentrate on the plot according to which it is organized, may have blunted perceptions of the important differences between the function of a discourse form and the function of an action sequence. Many of the parables appear in Matthean discourses; although they are narrative in form, they are discursive by context; so it will be helpful to keep in mind the two ways of observing a discourse: as part of the Gospel plot and as distinctive over against the narrative action.[115]

We may plot the story; we may also enter it. The invitation issued by the Matthean Gospel is, according to Thiemann, an invitation to enter the world of the text.[116] With broad strokes Thiemann depicts that 'world of the text'

---

[114] Milbank, *Theology*, 386: 'But if, on the one side, paradigm-becomes-narrative loses its provisional character, then on the other side, narrative-becomes-paradigm loses its temporal, historical character. Whereas the idea allows the narrative to flow, the narrative-paradigm is insulated, in a mystifying fashion, from its narrative genesis and later narrative consequences.'

[115] The subject is discussed in more detail in Chapter Three.

[116] Thiemann, *Revelation*.

and encourages us to enter it. The brushwork is worthy of an artist, but lacks the attention to detail required by an art lover. His bland dismissal of chs. 22-25 in three inaccurate lines suggests that the pace, if not also the plot, has been seriously misjudged. That section indicates clearly that the emplotment time differs radically from the biographical time: the Son of Man, who judges all, who will judge all, is himself judged (25:31–26:2). Has perhaps the influence of Frei's Christology, to which the annotations bear eloquent witness, influenced the artist's hands? We shall be looking for a more nuanced approach to the theology of Matthew than Thiemann's, one which belongs more clearly to the first century of Christian thought than to the twentieth, and one which recognizes the role of language and of metaphor in revealing the 'One Who Is'.[117]

To what extent then is it possible to say of all the synoptic parables, and to what extent can one say of the Jesus parables, that they create a fresh horizon for us, probing and changing our moral and religious understanding? A helpful clue is offered by Riches.[118] The parables of Jesus expressed, especially through the use of metaphor, his perception of God and the world. His metaphors challenged the commonplace beliefs of particular groups by using language in a creative, non-conventional sense. So Jesus' hearers were invited to revise their understanding of God's rule and entertain a different view of contemporary values and practice and humanity. He stretched the normal means of communication in the first century almost to breaking point as he attempted to describe what was significantly new. But this in turn opened the way for others of his own community whose linguistic conventions were different. They followed in his steps and contributed to the shaping of cultural webs whose strength can still be felt today. They responded in terms of their own language and culture, and in terms of their own community's life and practice.

To examine these significant shifts Riches uses the idea of *Wirkungsgeschichte*: that is, the method of plotting the historical effects of a text, from its original moment of interaction with its readers' expectations, through its subsequent readings, through its reproduction in literary form as those expectations change (not least as a result of the impact of the text itself), and through the impact of the features of the text in different situations, crises and moments of creativity. The method involves knowing what people thought at the time of the original utterance and what were the commonly accepted implications of a particular statement; it involves knowing how far Jesus was using existing terms in their standard

---

[117] Soskice, *Metaphor*, 153: 'This accretion of images, all of them hesitant and approximating, yet confirmed by generations of belief, constitutes much of what Christians call revelation.' See also Ward, *Barth, Derrida*, 170.

[118] Riches, *Community*.

sense and how far he was tailoring the material to his own purposes. That kind of tailoring could take place in many ways. The parable of *The Workers* is, according to Riches, a reworking of contemporary commonplace beliefs about justice and reward. The horizons of expectation are being redrawn:[119] the master's relation to the workers is shown to extend beyond any contractual obligations. In this way the pattern is set for a construction of new social worlds, exploring and probing popular understandings of human obligations. If we ask what this would have meant against contemporary Jewish expectations, against the background of fear of ἀνομία and a breakdown of moral norms, the parable would have addressed the fear that the relationship of the people to God had been disturbed or undermined. The parable would have been a discussion of God's justice and mercy, redirecting the community's self-understanding.

But what of that same parable in its Matthean context? How does the parable operate in that context? According to Riches, Matthew uses the parable of the Gentiles' situation vis à vis the Jews. He has set the parable in a Marcan context which almost has the effect of turning Mk 10:31, 'The first shall be last, and the last first', into a general rule. For Jesus the question is about the nature of God in the light of God's gifts; it asks what the fact that God rewards in different ways tells us about the nature of his rule and the consequences of this for those who feel outside his dispensation. Matthew is building a basis for a new kind of community; he is constructing a new world for his community and he is using as building blocks notions of the Law, of commands which those who are called into the service of the Kingdom are to obey, and of obedience that will be rewarded in the age to come. The new wine has to be put into old skins.

There is little doubt that the parables of Jesus paved the way for others whose linguistic conventions were different, and who in responding to the original impetus of the work and teaching of Jesus contributed to the shaping of new cultural webs. They responded in terms of their own language and culture, and in terms of their own community's life and practice. The relation of the parables of Jesus and the parables in Matthew can therefore usefully be presented in terms of *Wirkungsgeschichte.*

In four respects our study of the Matthean parables will enable us to see this *Wirkungsgeschichte* in a different way from that suggested by Riches. First, the history of the parable of *The Workers* is rather more complex than Riches suggests. This made it a richer and more controversial resource for Matthew to use. Second, a parable such as the Matthean *The Workers* does not necessarily reinforce obedience and rewards; it encourages reflection and

[119] For corroboration of this, see pp.159-161, 418-422.

responsibility. As Thysman sees,[120] the parables introduce important counterpoints to the legal material of Matthew. In so far as the parables are open-ended they encourage reflection on the use and function of legal material. Third, the Vision element within the parabolic material takes us, as part of the *Wirkungsgeschichte* of the texts, well beyond normal historical causalities.[121] It introduces elements into the definition of *Wirkungsgeschichte* which are especially evident in the history of the parables. There is an element of newness at work in the parables, transforming the tradition with a high degree of discontinuity between the beginning and the end of the New Testament parabolic material. The parables are, seen from the Matthean perspective, a rich theological resource on which to draw; and this is true in their discontinuity from, as well as in their continuity with, the parables of Jesus. Fourth, our fresh approach to the genre of Matthew indicates possible levels at which the writing of the Gospel may have operated within the structure of social change in early Christianity. It offered the opportunity to exercise responsibility, social and corporate, in the face of the ideologies of the day.

To summarize: Our primary concern has been to define a parable: do we mean the parable as Jesus used it, or the parable as the Gospel writer wrote it, or is there some criterion independent of the Gospels by which we may define a parable? To answer this we looked at four main areas of parabolic research. From a study of Jeremias's ten principles we concluded that if we mean by a parable the form which Jesus used, then we have probably evidence of only some forms which Jesus used, of only a limited number of distinctive elements which can be traced to him, and that we can reconstruct the detail of individual exemplars of those forms only with difficulty. We considered whether it was possible or right to separate the Jesus parables from other contemporary fictional narratives. Having studied the relation of Jesus' parables to the rabbinic and Hellenistic narrative tradition we found that, far from assisting us in identifying the specific character of the Jesus parables (except in the one issue of the persistent quality of the narratives),

---

120 Thysman, *Communauté*.

121 Wright, *People*, 433-434, adumbrates an alternative view: Jesus told apocalyptic as well as prophetic stories, and the early tradition brought out the thrust of the stories in terms of apocalyptic Jewish ideas. By way of illustration he suggests that Matthew found Mt 13:24-30,36-43 as a single unit and split it up, implying that it is therefore early. This is highly unlikely, as the later discussion of that Matthean section will show (see ch. 5). His suggestion that the usual order for the development of the parables should be entirely reversed is difficult to substantiate from the Matthean material. It seems curiously to repeat the errors of the past in dissociating narrative and longer parables from the extraordinary vitality of metaphorical imagery which is everywhere to be found in the synoptic material, in aphorisms and Wisdom, as in logia and riddles.

the comparisons tended to class the parables as communication. Form-critical studies by Westermann, Bultmann, Berger and Drury suggested a sharper classification: that the power of parables belongs within the prophetic tradition. The parables belong, as far as the ministry of Jesus is concerned, within an ancient framework of authoritative and divinely inspired declaration. Their metaphors, their history, their tradition and their theology are best examined using the prophetic tradition as a model. As Stacey has shown, the prophetic tradition was understood as a manifestation of divine reality. Within the transmission of the Jesus tradition the function of the parables shifted. The continuities of the parables with the imagery and aphorisms of the rest of the synoptic tradition, and their subtle functioning within literary contexts, point to the likelihood that similitudes and narratives belong to a creative stage of the tradition which stands behind the written texts. To judge by redaction-critical studies, no definition of the parable is complete which does not deal with their changed and their changing role. They accompany the good news within the Gospels. Within the Gospels some of them express an indebtedness to their social contexts: they point to forms of speech about God and these forms are indebted to the situations and communities to which the parables belonged. They also stimulate deeper questions on issues fundamental to those communities and their faith, not least because the Kingdom with which they are associated can be offered in spoken form. Finally, the genre studies point to the central difficulty of defining what a parable is. Parables hold a key place within Christian teaching and preaching; but it is not entirely clear how they operate there. Presumably they represented the world-view of Jesus, in contrast to the world-view of some of his contemporaries; and the question is how the form in which we now have those parables relates to that original world-view. There is also the question as to how the original parables and the parables in their present form contribute to the message of the written Gospels. One way of answering these questions is by tracing the effect of the parables within the work and witness of the Early Church. This is an important area of research. How far those effects can be traced systematically and causally in Matthew's Gospel will be examined in Chapter Three.

What then is a parable? The insights from these four areas of research show a form shifting from dynamic directness of prophecy to the greater openness of the literary mode.[122] They witness to a historical impulse

[122] The word 'openness' is used to indicate several interrelated possibilities: there is the openness of narrative fiction used in oral communication, by which even opponents may find themselves drawn into conversation (Linnemann, *Parables*) and faced with new issues and values (Arens, *Gleichnisse, Kommunikative Handlungen*, especially 66-68; Stein, *Introduction*); there is the

which was capable of generating the universal appeal of the good news. They illustrate the involvement of social forces and cultural attitudes within the history of an expanding testimony to the divine nature and to the universal, mysterious quality of language in its failure and resilience. That is the area of interest which we need to cover in our study of the Matthean parables. In so many ways the pattern which we are describing and the theological background in which it belongs resemble the history of the prophetic oracles; and that is the model which will be explored further as a basis for work on Matthew's Gospel.

This gives us the clear indications which we need for the next stage of the study. We have identified specific aspects of method which need to be incorporated into the study of the Matthean parables. To restrict the study to elements designated παραβολή would involve all manner of contradictions and inconsistencies. All imagery, aphorisms and narrative fictions are relevant to the study; the discussion of the Matthean parables would not be complete without them. All the four major areas of parabolic study will need to be represented, and the networks of influence will need to be traced for each parable. The order in which the parables are discussed will have to take these into account, so that inner relationships of the parables within the Gospel are fully exposed. We need to be aware of how the parabolic material relates to surrounding contexts, not only because the contexts suggest how the parables might be understood, but also because we need to measure the interaction within the Gospel of parabolic and non-parabolic material.

---

openness of what is written to the original reader and to the levels of readers and interpreters of later generations; there is also the openness of the text in terms of the events of disclosure which may attend the process of interpretation, performance and institutionalization (von Balthasar, *Theodramatik*, I 15-46; see also *Theologik*; Lash, *Theology*, Part II).

CHAPTER THREE

THE FUNCTION OF THE MATTHEAN PARABLES

The study of the Matthean parables can throw fresh light on the intention, purpose and genre of the Gospel as a whole. Chapter One looked at the possibility of a new genre model. Chapter Two indicated the range of material which needs to be addressed if the Matthean parables are to be studied. This chapter explores the seven areas, noted in the Introduction, where new approaches to the Gospel are needed. It considers the role of the parables in each of them. Detailed commentaries on all the parables are in Part Two, and the method and arguments basic to this chapter will be found there. It is sufficient to say at this stage that Part Two comments on the parables in all the groupings which reveal networks of interest, source, context and material. They are examined under the five headings of: 1) micro- and macro-contexts, along with the associated figurative material there; 2) their literary redaction, Gattung, Form and structure; 3) their 'history of tradition' with consideration of synchronic and diachronic parallels, and how they were used; 4) their distinctiveness in relation to the corpus of parables; and 5) their distinctiveness in relation to redaction.

The first of the seven studies noted in the Introduction concerns the inadequacy of the traditional hypotheses used to solve the synoptic problem. In the light of refinements to the study of vocabulary and style in the Synoptic Gospels, the Streeter hypothesis, although preferable to all others, lacks a suitable model by which to monitor the changes from the sources to the finished Gospels. The parables in Matthew suggest one way in which this might be attempted. The Matthean Chapter of Parables, Mt 13, as is the case with Mt 18, presents its source material in a network of relationships, within the chapter and with Marcan and Q sources outside the chapter, requiring more than a literary solution. Although Mt 13 has a clear beginning (13:1) there is a flow of material from Mt 11 to Mt 13.[1] Matthew chs. 11-13 form a complex of material, demarcated by 11:1 and 13:53, which draws material from both Mark and Q. Two parables with parallels in Luke sit awkwardly in this Matthean context.[2] *The Children's Games* (Mt 11:16-19/Lk 7:31-35)[3] mocks the inconsistency of those who

[1] See pp.191-193.
[2] Catchpole, *Q*, 47.
[3] See p.268.

reject both John and Jesus. In the Matthean context however the parable creates unexpected associations. Matthew's use of ἔργων in 11:19 and ἔργα in 11:2 has the effect of linking together with Wisdom not only John and Jesus but the disciples as well (10:8; 11:5; see 11:23). They all share the dangerous calling of Wisdom's envoys (10:17-42; 11:12-13/Lk 16:16). The section from Mt 11:2 to 11:29 is not exactly a model of clarity. Matthew's addenda to the unit Mt 11:3-29/Lk 7:19-35 contain tortuous movement of thought, especially in 11:11-15. The thought shifts to and fro, giving various estimates of John, which suggests that the writer was not free to order the material logically and clearly. From that point of view, and from the point of language, source, form and redaction criticism, Mt 11:2-19 could well have been pre-Matthean; in form-critical terms it is a scholastic apothegm to which other traditions have been attached. The second of the parables, *The Unclean Spirit* (Mt 12:43-45/Lk 11:24-26),[4] would have been an appropriate sequel to the Beelzebub controversy in Matthew as well as in Luke. That is confirmed by an overview of the Matthean parabolic material in that section. In Matthew the picture of *The Divided Kingdom* (Mt 12:25-26),[5] with its aspects of absolute authority on the one hand and civil war and desolation on the other, is suggestive of the chasm between Jesus' world and the world of his opponents, between the powers of evil and the power of God's Spirit; the three other parabolic sayings underline that contrast. *The Unclean Spirit* would have followed that sequence most appropriately, perhaps more appropriately than is the case in the Lucan form of the controversy (Lk 11:14-23; see the '*Will of God*' logion at Mt 12:50 and Lk 11:28). The reason why *The Unclean Spirit* does not appear at the end of the Beelzebub controversy in Matthew is much more easily explained by reference to the tag 'this evil generation' (Mt 12:39,45) than through any immediate thematic association. That is not to imply that *The Unclean Spirit* makes no sense in its current Matthean position. In Matthew it is a fable pointing out the continual threat mounted by the powers of evil, against which the only defences are (with the support of the Spirit) the positive qualities of religious living (watching your language, being receptive to the will of God, exercising humility, taking up your cross). But that is a tribute to the flexibility of a fable rather than a reason why Matthew might have put it where it stands.

Such concerns as we recognize in the fable (Mt 12:24-26) make 13:1 a continuation as much as a new opening. What goes before and what comes after 13:1 concerns the dangers and opportunities of Christian living. The shape and order of what follows in 13:1ff is one of the most intriguing

[4] See pp.272-273.
[5] See pp.270-272.

questions in the whole Gospel. Of particular interest are two parallel groupings of material: *The Sower* and its Interpretation,[6] divided (as in Mark) by the explanation about the role of parables, and *The Tares* and its Interpretation,[7] divided by a group of parables and a fulfilment saying about 'parables'. The extraordinary feature of the former, the parable of *The Sower*, is that the Matthean form of the Interpretation does not pick up some of the distinctive features of the Matthean form of the parable. A careful comparison of the two forms of the parable, the Marcan and the Matthean, and the two forms of the Interpretation, the Marcan and Matthean, suggest they all four had a degree of independence. Certainly the complicated pattern revealed by the comparison makes it highly unlikely that Matthew sat down with both parable and Interpretation and did some editing on the Marcan forms to produce the Matthean. Between the parable and its Interpretation stands Mt 13:14-17, a section which includes the explanation of the role of parables. It is common to both Mark and Matthew, and gives the Interpretation of *The Sower* a revelatory context, underlined by Matthew through the addition of the beatitude in 13:16 (a Q logion). In the second of the parallel groupings, *The Tares* has a far more controversial tradition history. It resembles the Marcan parable of *The Seed Growing Secretly* in vocabulary but not in form. It is a companion of the *The Mustard Seed* and *The Leaven*, two Q parables. Its position in Mt 13 fits with both relationships, the relationships with Mark and with Q material. Its Interpretation lacks some of the links with *The Seed Growing Secretly* but has itself associations with another parable, *The Net*.[8] The ending of *The Tares* and the ending of its Interpretation use vocabulary found in the Q version of John the Baptist's teaching. Most interesting of all is the parallel syntax of the Matthean Interpretation of *The Tares* and the Interpretation of *The Sower*, a parallelism which Matthew and Luke share against Mark (alongside other Minor Agreements in those passages).[9] The position of the Interpretation of *The Tares*, separated from its parable not only by the fulfilment saying but also by *The Mustard Seed* and *The Leaven*, adds a further feature to the picture. There is no simple explanation for such a web of relationships. Nor is there is a simple conclusion to be drawn regarding the overall shape of the chapter. Certainly there is no overall programme for the chapter to be read off from the initial Particles.[10] One dividing point in this part of Mt 13 is the departure of Jesus from the crowd and the approach of the disciples to Jesus. The Interpretation of *The Tares* follows. A partial

[6] See pp.287-289, 303-305.
[7] See pp.331-332.
[8] See pp.315-316, 356.
[9] See pp.303-304; p.29 n.34.
[10] See pp.289-290.

explanation of this web of relationships would be to assume that a well-known story such as *The Sower* circulated widely and that its Interpretation circulated also, sometimes independently. But that would be only a partial solution unless two further assumptions are made: first, that some early form of *The Tares* had a relationship to the Q parables, perhaps through a grouping of parables; and, second, that the pattern of *The Sower* and its Interpretation influenced one other parable, and one only, namely *The Tares*. Implied in that solution would be a very significant admission: that the Marcan and the Q material had some level of interplay before the writing down of Matthew's Gospel. In one way, because the subject matter is parabolic, that is not altogether surprising. Parables are stories for telling, and of all the synoptic material the parables are the most likely to have been broadcast through several different areas of the Early Church. Nor is it particularly difficult to envisage collections of parables. The Beelzebub controversy illustrates how a triple or quadruple use of parabolic pictures makes a highly effective response within an argument.

The complexity of these relationships in Matthew 13 requires something more than a literary solution. It seems to require space and time for the gathering of parabolic collections and for influences to pass to and fro between those who espoused particular traditions. It seems to require, as the history of *The Tares* suggests, someone who worked with the various traditions over a period of time, listening to them, rehearsing them and eventually bringing them into the form of a written composition. The process also involved bringing together material with different emphases. The Interpretation of *The Tares* encouraged patience with other people, even with those who might be regarded as sinful, in the sure knowledge that all must eventually be called to account. By contrast other parts of Matthew's Gospel, such as 18:15-17, required an immediate disciplinary response to those who transgressed specific accepted norms. It appears that material with different emphases has been brought together. The acceptance of traditions by those espousing different viewpoints is an important assumption. It is part of the model by which the synoptic problem can be solved and the Streeter hypothesis given a working basis.

There is another overlap of Marcan and Q materials in Matthew chs. 21-22. It is by no means clear whether the interlocking vocabulary, some of which is special to those contexts, points to an earlier triplet of Vineyard parables, or to a triplet involving a Marcan and two Q parables (*The Tenants*, *The Two Sons* and *The Feast*).[11] An earlier grouping of parables is very likely. The Matthean group of parables in Mt 21-22 is concerned with the 'replacement motif'. It is usual to explain their presence and form

[11] See pp.400, 409-410.

in terms of Matthean redaction: Matthew wished to show that Israel had been rejected and another nation had taken its place. The linguistic evidence does not support that judgment. It is unlikely that the 'replacement motif' was redactional, and, on balance, it is more likely that the grouping of 'replacement' parables took place in advance of Matthew's work.[12] Almost certainly 'replacement' was already a feature of the parable of *The Feast*[13] at the level of its Q background. As for the parable of *The Two Sons*,[14] the history of that particular parable is a mystery. The clearest moment in its tradition history is its association with 21:32c, where there is a contrast between two groups: sinners whose initial refusal was followed by a change of heart, and others who though they initially refused were later given a second chance to repent, but to no avail. *The Two Sons* is a classic rabbinic morality parable, and its history may be linked with the Q 'rejection topos' in Lk 7:29-30. Although in Matthew it anticipates two clear statements of the 'replacement motif' (21:43 and 22:8-9), and although it can itself be regarded as an expression of that motif, it is rather more than that. It is about a second chance for the leaders of Israel to repent, a second chance to which the question about authority in Mt 21:23-27 provides an introduction (21:25). John provided them with a first opportunity; he offered a baptism of repentance (see Lk 7:29-30). The arrival of Jesus provided a second. There are several other opportunities for repentance in two following parables, the parables of *The Tenants* (Mt 21:33-46) and *The Feast* (22:1-14). So there is a common theme to all three parables (*The Tenants*, *The Feast* and *The Two Sons*). *The Tenants* and *The Feast* have developed a form of the 'replacement motif' which is overtly moral: repentance must take the form of moral action in the face of impending judgment. 21:31c is phrased more ambiguously (see Lk 7:29), and presumably it was not Matthew who created the ambiguity. So the parables in Matthew chs. 21-22, like Mt 13:2ff, may represent an overlap of Q and Marcan parabolic interests. According to that material, acts of unrighteousness would be judged; the unrepentant leaders of Israel have been warned that the judgment would come.

Another group of parables brings together the same combination of Q and Marcan material. This is to be found in the eschatological discourse: *The Thief, The Two Servants* and *The Ten Young Women* (Mt 24:42-44/Lk 12:39-40; Mt 24:45-51/Lk 12:42-46; Mt 25:1-13/Lk 12:35-36).[15] Mt 24:42 and 25:13 surround the trio with the call to watchfulness, a motif which is shared by Mark and Q (see Lk 12:37). Watchfulness means

[12] See p.412.
[13] See pp.409-410.
[14] See pp.390-399.
[15] See pp.429, 443-445.

avoiding carelessness, laziness, unreadiness, especially unreadiness for the Son of Man. So the trio both at the level of Q and at the level of the Gospels is concerned with different aspects of watchfulness, and especially watchfulness for the coming of the Son of Man. The pre-Lucan concern is with the reward for watchfulness; the pre-Matthean Q material is concerned with watchfulness as obedience. This trio of parables has a very significant feature. It exhibits variations in the agreements between Matthew and Luke; there is very close agreement in wording between Matthew and Luke in the parable of *The Servants* and fairly close agreement in *The Thief*;[16] this contrasts sharply with the major differences between Matthew and Luke in the third member of the trio. These variations in agreement are difficult to explain on the basis of a fixed Q text, especially when the third part of the trio moves into an area not usually covered by Matthew, that of death and the issues which death raises.

In sum, Mt 13, Mt 20-21 and Mt 24-25 all witness to the existence of groups of parables at earlier stages of the synoptic tradition. A trio of parables has the advantages of intensity, exploration and encouragement to decision. A threefold presentation gives emphasis; it encourages discursive reflection; and it commends decisive action. The development of such groupings of parables in advance of Matthew's Gospel brought together material from Marcan and Q traditions. In some cases the form of these collections cannot have been the result of Matthean redaction. The complex way in which these collections were formed is difficult to explain using literary redactional theories. The Streeter hypothesis offers the best possibility of an explanation, but on its own the Streeter hypothesis is insufficient to explain all the details. A different model is required, according to which pre-Matthean parabolic collections of material were made and were drawn from Marcan and Q sources. In advance of the final writing down of the Gospel of Matthew these collections were presumably rehearsed by Christian groups. It would make most sense if these groups of Christians were acquainted with either Mark or Q. They espoused different attitudes and practices, and were beginning to share common features of the Jesus tradition. In this way the parables point to a new model for understanding how Matthew's Gospel developed.

The second of the seven areas of study where new approaches to the Gospel of Matthew are needed concerns the structure of the Gospel. Attempts made to monitor the plot of Matthew's Gospel have often rested on insecure judgments.[17] False judgments have been made regarding critical points in the Gospel narrative. The functions of the Matthean discourses in

[16] See pp.227, 433-435.
[17] See pp.35, 105.

relation to the whole structure have been variously assessed. The discourses have been treated as part of the narrative and not as a distinctive feature within that narrative.[18] So the monitoring of the plot and of the structure of the Gospel both need fresh attention. The parables become important in this discussion when it is recognized that four of them occupy structurally significant positions within the discourses: *The Two Houses* (Mt 7:24-27), *The Householder* (Mt 13:52), *The Unforgiving Servant* (Mt 18:23-35) and *The Sheep and the Goats* (Mt 25:31-46).[19] The position of the four parables can be described as follows: each of them occurs immediately before a Matthean demarcation formula, before 7:28 'When Jesus concluded these words', before 13:53 'When Jesus concluded these parables', before 19:1 and before 26:1 'When Jesus concluded all these words'. There are minor textual variations in these formulae which were dealt with earlier.[20] Each of the four parables concludes a section demarcated by a Matthean formula; and since parables conclude synoptic sections only rarely, the similar position of these four deserves attention. They constitute a structural feature of the First Gospel.

There are four ways of discussing this structural feature. The first defines the ways in which the parables 'conclude' their Matthean sections; the second looks at the generalization that 'parables conclude synoptic sections only rarely', the third examines some of the redactional possibilities opened up by the discussion of the four parables, and the fourth examines their role in relation to the structure of the Gospel as a whole.

Although the four parables have a common position in that all four precede concluding formulae, they operate in that position in different ways. The senses in which they 'conclude' the Matthean discourse material differ. Each of the four can be said to provide its own distinctive kind of conclusion to the material in which it stands.

To identify these differences the parables need to be examined with four factors in mind: 1) the frame of reference provided for each parable by its preceding context; 2) the character of the connecting links joining the parable to its context; 3) the structural and linguistic features of the parable; 4) the nature of the imagery employed in it.

The last three of the factors, 2), 3) and 4), are self-explanatory. The first of them needs expansion; it concerns the frame of reference provided by the parable's preceding context. It is possible to assume that the section concluded by the parable and its concluding formula is the Matthean discourse. *The Two Houses* concludes the Sermon on the Mount; *The Householder* provides the ending for the Chapter of Parables; *The*

[18] See pp.139-140.
[19] See ch. 4.
[20] See p.10 n.7.

Unforgiving Servant is the closing word for the chapter on Discipline; and *The Sheep and the Goats* is the finale of the Eschatological Discourse. As has been indicated, that is not necessarily a safe assumption. The start of the discourse is not as clearly demarcated as its conclusion. The Sermon on the Mount has a well-defined opening, but the same cannot be said of the other three sections, those concluded by *The Householder*, *The Unforgiving Servant* and *The Sheep and the Goats*. Scholarly discussion of these sections has not infrequently insisted that they should be treated as parts of larger units: Mt 13 has been treated as continuous with chs. 11-12;[21] Mt 18 has been extended to include thematic material in 17:22-27,[22] and Mt 25 has been considered as part of a major unit inclusive of chs. 23-25.[23] The method used here takes account of these possible variations. It also avoids one particular danger, the danger of treating the concluding formula as positive proof that the previous material is a unit with an identifiable theme or subject. The previous material may not be clearly defined as a unit and may be less homogeneous than is implied by a theme or heading.

With those four factors in mind we examine each of the four parables. We ask first: in what ways is it appropriate to speak of the parables concluding the sections of Matthean material?

The frame of reference for *The Two Houses* (7:24-27) is provided by two of the emphases in the Sermon on the Mount: on the one hand 'end-time judgment' (7:21-23) and on the other 'Wisdom morality', with its associated motifs of providence and obedience (6:25-34).[24] A connecting link between the parable and its context is provided by 7:24: πᾶς οὖν ὅστις ἀκούει μου τοὺς λόγους τούτους καὶ ποιεῖ αὐτούς, ὁμοιωθήσεται.... This includes the emphatic μου, often interpreted as a reference to the authority of the one who delivers the sermon.[25] Structurally the Matthean parable has a distinctively antithetical and compact style, a style which has been designated on the basis of rabbinic parables 'a geminate parable';[26] and its linguistic features support the twin emphases of judgment and wisdom. The imagery of the parable provides a climax to the figurative material.[27] At the centre of the parable stands an 'emblematic metaphor': τεθεμελίωτο γὰρ ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν. By 'emblematic metaphor' is meant a metaphor which by virtue of its wide field of associations is capable of a number of different references which can be brought into a significant relationship with each

[21] See pp.110, 191.
[22] See pp.17 n.18, 213.
[23] See p.10 n.7.
[24] See p.182.
[25] See pp.179 n.7, 185, 176 n.3 (iii).
[26] See pp.143-146.
[27] See pp.181-182.

other.[28] 'Foundation' and 'rock' possess such a field of association. Muszyński's work[29] on those metaphors in the Qumran material illustrates the point well. Within the frame of reference provided by the Sermon on the Mount, τεθεμελίωτο γὰρ ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν has many associations; it refers to the teaching authority of Jesus (perhaps also by association to the authority of Peter), to Wisdom and the divine providence in the cosmos, and to ethics in relation to the glory and purpose of God (to name three). In sum, the parable of *The Two Houses*, seen from the standpoint of our four main aspects, points to the authority of Christ; its imagery serves as a climactic reference to the concerns of the Sermon on the Mount as a whole.

The Householder (13:52) has a frame of reference provided by Mt 11-13: the privileges and dangers of those who are called to hear and do God's will revealed in God's Son. The connecting sentence 13:51, which links the parable with its context, and the opening phrase of 13:52, διὰ τοῦτο, are used to point to a wide frame of reference: συνήκατε ταῦτα πάντα;[30] 'Understanding' in Matthew involves moral commitment and a recognition of the harmony between divine revelation in Wisdom, in the Law and in the Son. The parable operates as a riddle, with both biblical and non-biblical associations. As a riddle, closely attached to 13:51, it invites the hearer to make up his or her own mind what this is all about, whether the hearer can make sense of what God has been doing and what Jesus has been teaching; it suggests that if the hearer can understand then the designation 'discipled scribe' is well deserved.[31] The concluding phrase of the riddle, καινὰ καὶ παλαιά, can best be described as a 'symbolic phrase'; it is an evocative phrase, rich in historical and contemporary resonances, capable of drawing together many of the strands of concern mentioned in the preceding context: e.g. the revelation of God, Law and Wisdom, issues of hearing and doing, and numerous examples of 'new and old', what is novel as against what is well known, what is authoritative over against new interpretations of it. The final phrase, couched in the form of a riddle, expresses the challenge and promise of the Kingdom: Can you understand what God is about? If you can, then you deserve the name of a 'discipled scribe'!

The Unforgiving Servant (18:23-35) also stands in a distinctive relationship to its context. Its final sentence (18:35), one of the connecting links between the parable and its context, uses a phrase paralleled in the Testament of Gad and in other parts of the interpretative tradition based on Lev 19:17-18.[32] Its opening sentence, 18:22, is in a loose relationship to

---

[28] See p.185.
[29] Muszyński, *Fundament.*
[30] See pp.189 n.61, 209 n.131, 211.
[31] See p.200.
[32] See p.22 n.21.

the preceding Petrine pericopes on 'forgiveness' (18:21-22) and on 'freedom' (17:24-27). Structurally the parable itself is unusual in that it begins as a classic 'epic parable', but its third section is reworked considerably.[33] Its imagery is noteworthy, as is its use of the Verb μακροθυμέω.[34] As a concluding parable, in that context *The Unforgiving Servant* is heard as part of the extended answer to the question with which Mt 18 opens: 'Who is the greatest in the Kingdom of Heaven?'[35] In sum, the parable explores in narrative form the standards of behaviour and attitude which the preceding context presents.

The Sheep and the Goats (25:31-46), by its length and its position at the end of a sequence of parables, deserves the title of 'a finale'. Its frame of reference might seem to be the eschatological motif of 'watching', the obedient response to God's will maintained to the end. But the parable of *The Sheep and the Goats* cannot be restricted to this. It takes in also the ethical concerns mentioned in relation to 7:24-27 with its confirmation of Christ's authority, the association of morality and understanding with the Son's revelation (13:52) and the emphasis on compassion in 18:21-35. Its position as a finale makes it a concluding parable not only for Mt 23-25 but of all the discourses. The connecting links between the parable and its context are unusual too. 25:31-32 points forward to the Passion Narrative (especially to 26:2 and 27:11), for the Son of Man who is to be the judge at the end is himself unjustly judged;[36] 25:46 by contrast points back to earlier material in the Gospel, recapitulating the warning that humankind will be divided into those who will receive punishment and those who will receive reward. However, all who hear the judge recognize the criteria by which they are to be judged and those who receive a reward do not know when they served Christ in the needy; those features give a new perspective to the division between punishment and reward.[37] As far as the structure of the parable is concerned this is unique among the parables.[38] It is a compound of various forms, some of which are in themselves unique. Among its constituent elements is the sole example in the Synoptic Gospels of a collatio (25:32), i.e. a simile in which the sentence to be embellished and the comparison embellishing it have balancing parts. In sum, the parable is a finale, a recapitulation, a summary with regard to content, bringing theological and ethical concerns from the other discourses, as well as from other major structural sections of the Gospel, to a fresh point of focus.

---

[33] See pp.219-223.
[34] See p.217.
[35] See p.225.
[36] See pp.238, 263.
[37] See pp.248, 260-263.
[38] See pp.262-263.

The four parables conclude their sections and do so in different ways. *The Two Houses* gathers up the imagery and concerns of the Sermon on the Mount by means of an 'emblematic metaphor', giving a climactic affirmation of Christ's authority. *The Householder* uses a symbolic phrase to question the hearer's commitment to the Kingdom; *The Unforgiving Servant* is haggadic; *The Sheep and the Goats* is a finale, a backcloth against which the Passion and Resurrection are to be heard. Each shares a common position in front of a concluding formula, and each is unique in the way it occupies that position. They differ markedly in their functions. The senses in which they conclude their Matthean sections are very varied.

How distinctive within the synoptic tradition are these 'concluding' parables? It was suggested earlier that parables in the synoptic tradition do not normally occur at the end of sections. Does this mean that the use of summary parables or concluding parables is a Matthean redactional feature? The relevant material points in a different direction: 1) There are a few synoptic parables and picture sayings outside Matthew which conclude synoptic sections: some of these are apothegms (Mk 2:17,22), where the concluding or the penultimate logion is a picture saying; there is one group of parables, in Luke 15,[39] in which the earlier parables in the chapter are brought to a climax in a final parable (Lk 15:11-32), although the sequence of parables begun at Lk 15:3 continues into the following chapter (Lk 16:1-9); and there is one example outside Matthew of a parable with a concluding formula and that is Lk 6:46-49, the Lucan form of the parable of *The Two Houses*. 2) Comparison of the Matthean uses of parabolic material with what appears in comparable material in the other Synoptists contributes further data. Mark 2:17 has a final logion and picture saying but Matthew 9:13 (Diff Mk) divides them with an Old Testament quotation. In Lk 8:18 the Chapter of Parables is concluded not by a parable but by a logion. The same is true also in the Marcan parallel at Mk 4:34. As distinct from these the Matthean Chapter of Parables concludes with the final parable Mt 13:52. 3) There are three further Matthean parables which might be regarded as concluding sections of material: The parable of *The Children's Games* (Mt 11:16-19; Lk 7:31-35) is treated by Bultmann as the conclusion of a scholastic apothegm.[40] In Matthew it is followed by a logion, as in Luke (Lk 7:35), and both Gospel writers qualify the apothegmatic character of the parable by the context which they provide. The parable of *The Unclean Spirit* (Mt 12:33-35) has already been considered;[41] in all probability the Matthean section of which it is a part concludes with 12:50, and in Luke the parable (Lk 11:24-26) is followed by an attack on 'this generation' (Lk

[39] Bailey, *Poet and Peasant.*
[40] See p.92.
[41] See p.111.

11:29-33). The parable of *The Sheep* concludes the first half of the discourse in Mt 18; in Luke it opens the sequence of parables in Lk 15 (Lk 15:3-7). In Matthew 18 *The Sheep* concludes the discussion of 'the little ones' and prepares the way for the section on compassion and discipline in the second half of the chapter. So the two parables in Mt 18, *The Sheep* and *The Unforgiving Servant*, both serve as haggadic conclusions, and balance each other within the structure of the whole chapter.

These three kinds of data provide a perspective on the generalization that synoptic parables do not normally conclude sections. They indicate that concluding parables are not unknown in the Synoptists; they appear particularly in the material common to Matthew and Luke. They provide no evidence that concluding parables are a matter of Matthean redaction. For Matthew appears to mask the concluding function of the parable in a number of cases, notably in Mt 9:13. This throws into relief one further feature of Matthew. Only four of the concluding formulae have so far been mentioned. There are five in all and the second of these, in Mt 11:1, is not prefaced by a parable. It could have been. Mt 9:38 would have provided an excellent concluding parable for the Mission Discourse. That 9:38 does not appear in a parabolic form is interesting evidence. Perhaps to expect a parable there is to mistake both the nature of Matthew's redactional activity and the nature of the second discourse.

What then is the relation of the four concluding parables to Matthean redactional method? It is noteworthy that the four parables are different in structure. *The Two Houses* is a geminate parable, and only one other geminate parable is to be found in the synoptic material, Mt 21:28-32, and that has a pre-Matthean history in a geminate form. *The Householder* is a riddling Wisdom parable. *The Unforgiving Servant* is an epic parable with a restructured third section in which Matthean elements are embedded (e.g. Mt 5:25-26; 6:12-15). *The Sheep and the Goats* is structurally without parallel and its composite character is best explained by a process of tradition and creativity. What they have in common is that their language is employed in a similar way. Their imagery is used in a way which provides a focus for the preceding material. It is the use of imagery which we find in Mt 9:12-13; there the Old Testament quotation introduces a delicate synecdoche by means of which the comparison between Jesus and the doctor becomes their common expression of compassion. It is how imagery is used which is remarkable in Matthew, and not only the extent of that imagery.[42] In the

[42] It might be argued that structure and imagery are relatively unimportant considerations in decisions in the area of redaction. The decisive decisions are to be made with reference to language. In Part Two the language of each of the parables is analysed with the detail prescribed in Chapter One. It is apparent

case of the four concluding parables their structural differences and their use of imagery are both relevant to the present discussion.

The one synoptic precedent for a concluding parable is the conclusion of the Sermon on the Mount and the Sermon on the Plain, and in both the parable is followed by a concluding formula. In an earlier discussion of the syntax of the concluding formula[43] the unusual syntax of 7:28 in relation to the other concluding formulae was explained as a result of the Matthean version of the Marcan narrative outline (Mt 8:1/Mk 1:40). The curious syntax is a result of the formula being adapted to its new context. That explanation serves also in 13:53 and 19:1, where the new contexts did not require such an adjustment; there the formula could stand unchanged. If that explanation is correct, then we are dealing in the case of the formulae with pre-existing units, not only in the case of 7:28, which is confirmed as pre-Matthean by the parallel in Luke, but also in the case of the other discourses. But that carries with it the implication that the formulae and parables concluded material which had been formed into discourses before the Gospel of Matthew was written. The Chapter of Parables, as we know from Mark 4, was already in existence, as were other groups of parables which appear in Mt 13. A large section of Mt 18 was probably a pre-existing unit. The eschatological discourse was already in existence as a group of parables. It is not clear what impulse produced the Sermon on the Mount. One answer claims that the ancient epitome explains the collecting of material in a summary form and that the epitome explains also why the material ended with a parable.[44]

The function of the concluding parables is that they are reflective, summarizing and cumulative. In the case of 18:23-35 the parable complements and interprets 18:21-22. It indicates that 18:21-22 is not a rule book but an encouragement to personal and corporate responsibility. The parable of *The Sheep and the Goats* develops this further. As a major recapitulation of the discourses, it represents that call for responsibility at the level of content. It presents the criteria by which all know that they will be judged, criteria which are recognizable as a summary of the teaching of Jesus, warning also that knowledge is not enough; action is what counts (see Mt 7:24-27). As in the issue of 'righteousness' and 'justice', mercy and compassion too have to be expressed in deeds. However, action will not necessarily be accompanied by a perception of what is involved. Behind the genuine service of those in need is a reality which may not be perceived, the

---

there that from the point of view of language there is no case to be made for the four parables being redactional creations.

[43] p.10 n.7.

[44] Betz, *Sermon*, 15 n.76. For a parallel development among the formula quotations, see the function of 2:23 as a climactic summary.

presence of Christ in the hungry, the thirsty, the refugees, the naked, the ill, and the imprisoned. The final parable thus becomes the focus in which all the discourses can be seen.

The significance of the four parables for the structure of the Gospel is therefore as follows. The four parables are part of a tradition accepted by the Gospel writer. They show an awareness of the potential within imagery, especially as an aid to sharpening moral awareness, extending personal and corporate responsibility, and providing a universal justification for ethics. They cannot be interpreted only in terms of their content; their function also is important. Structurally they point to the significance of the discourses for understanding the Gospel as a whole. The discourses are not only a balance for the narrative material; the discourses provide the critical means by which the Gospel as a whole is to be understood. They offer the skills, attitudes and concepts by which the narrative of the Gospel can be appropriated for the task of discipleship. Far from being part of the narrative flow, they suspend the narrative flow so that there can be more reflection on it. They transform the biographical Gospel genre, shifting it towards a new genre within which the discourse, perhaps parallel to the secular genre of the epitome, has an instructive and reflective function.

This leads us to the third of the seven studies. Structuralism has given rise to a world of new approaches to the Gospels and it is only possible here to consider two which are immediately relevant to the study of the Matthean Gospel: the parables as unfinished stories, and the parables as deep structures. First we look at the implications for the Matthean Gospel that its many parables can be regarded as unfinished stories. What does it mean for the genre of the Gospel that communities of readers, past and present, in reading or hearing the parables construct what counts for them as the meaning of the text? What does it mean for our understanding of the Gospel that readers should fill in the meaning of a text which would otherwise remain only a potential meaning This filling in of the text may be discussed along several different possible lines. On the one hand the community of readers may be predisposed to read the text in accordance with the norms which form part of their community life. They may be committed to a text as affirming their identity as a community. They may make connections between different parts of the text which support their own norms. On the other hand the text can discipline community reading. The text might indicate expectations which draw the reader or readers into a different world which challenges preconceptions and encourages a review of accepted norms. It may be that the text explicitly indicates the writer's perspective; or the actors in the story may make an alternative viewpoint attractive, or the plot itself draws the readers into events which open up a new world of perception and understanding. In that case the readers could

distance themselves from those aspects of the text. They may select what suits them, understanding the text as they choose. They may decline to be drawn into the text or reserve the right to their own reading of it. In those circumstances parables function in a distinctive way; while not necessarily exercising a limitation on the readers, they can have the effect of making readers more self-aware. Parables can operate as independent units, as stories heard apart from a context. Parables can be read as distinct units, unlimited by a particular context or set of texts or traditions; they then offer the hearer freedom to explore and to shape what is heard. The readers or hearers realize the stories as they wish. The stories are open-textured, incomplete in detail and explanation, leaving room for the hearers to appropriate for themselves what they have heard. In doing so they make stories which, as they are rehearsed and remade, reflect back the hearers' own wishes, hopes and ideas. In this way readers can become aware of who they are. In and through the story they become open to their own self-scrutiny. The readers' response becomes a means of self-knowledge.

More may occur in the process of reading. The distance between what the readers have made of the story and their more careful re-reading of the text can have the effect of deepening that self-scrutiny and challenging deeply cherished ideas and attitudes. The discovery that the story has a particular place in a particular narrative can have a similar effect. What was appropriated as an autonomous unit becomes a tradition heard at depth, as a first hearing of *Hamlet* is given depth by the experiencing of other Shakespearean texts. There may be resistance to the outworking of the text and consequent self-scrutiny; the readers' community norms may be too strong; or there may be suspicion that the story was another group's power base. On the other hand, humour, or the quality of the narration or plot, or the insistent appeal of a group of related stories may prove an irresistible attraction, and fresh attention can result.

An interesting feature of the genre model suggested in Chapter One is that it adds fresh features to this particular discussion. In the first place it recognizes that the hearers may already possess a commitment to some of the narratives, so that the writer's recommended predispositions may already be part of the hearers' life and faith. The writer is not therefore imposing a foreign ideology upon the initial hearers; the material included has some purchase already on the hearers' attention and understanding. If, however, the traditions and stories included in the Gospel came from different traditions and communities, not from their own, then there may be antipathies to overcome. The relation of the audience to what they hear may be mixed; they are conversant with some of what is rehearsed but not with all.

The discussion of reader-response in relation to the Matthean parables needs to be taken still further. If it is characteristic of parables that they

reflect self-awareness and encourage self-knowledge, is that the only contribution which they make? Does the reader-response approach imply that meaning is limited to the readers' construction of the text or to the readers' construction with some help from the author and plot? Does it make any difference that the parables stand in the Jesus tradition rather than in any other kind of tradition? Do they operate now as they operated then?

The question of how they operated in Matthew's time is not easily answered. One school of Matthean interpretation has emphasized the authoritative character of Jesus in Matthew.[45] His word is sufficient to heal (Mt 8:8,16); his teaching is authoritative for all time (28:18-20). His authority is underlined by the association of his work and teaching with the divine Wisdom and the ancient Law. He is the agent and son revealing the will of the Father. He teaches with authority. His parables occupy a similar position to the oracles of the prophets, as part of a divine engagement with human history.[46] Is that compatible with a view of the parables as self-revelatory, as community-based, as expressing a variety of judgments and opinions?

It is of course the case that reader-response readings take us far beyond the question of how the first readers heard the parables. Such readings are based on general theories which suggest how we read and how texts have meaning for us. In this Matthean study our concern is more limited. We are concerned not in the first place with how we realize the potential of the parables today but with how reader-response theories can illuminate the earliest reading of the Gospel. Our concerns are: How did the text of Matthew's Gospel have meaning for its original readers? How did they understand the parables? How did their understanding of authority affect their reading of or hearing of the parables? That is a question to which we shall return, but it is a question which takes on a particular form when it is asked of parables as unfinished stories, awaiting an audience to complete them. How are open-ended stories related to the call to obedience by God's Son?

The study of the parables in the discourses provides an intriguing answer. The original hearers had heard the parables before, as individual stories or as groups of stories; now they were being encouraged to hear them as stimulants to responsible behaviour. They were asked to reflect on them and respond to them. The stories were part of a structure which refused to give precise instruction and opened up deep questions of attitude, motivation and policy. To that extent the reader-response approaches open up a fruitful discussion about the earliest readers and the meaning they gave to the parables.

---

[45] Blair, *Jesus*.

[46] See pp.93-94.

But how could they read the parables in that way and accept the teaching of Jesus as authoritative? The parables in the discourses provide a positive response. The parable of *The Sheep and the Goats* underlined the authority of Jesus. His task of future judge gave him an ultimate authority. But the authority of his teaching was as much in his presence in the needy, as the one who would not break the bruised reed and as the one who was himself unjustly judged, as it was in the content of what he taught. What he taught was already part of the universally accepted criteria of human responsibility, except that the fulfilment of those criteria was required at a quite different level of achievement from what everyone anticipated. The writer of the Gospel not only opened up the parables for reflection and thought, but provided also a structure of thought which made sense of such reflection. The freedom to appropriate the parables was given in the ultimate authorization of responsible action.

In one important respect the issues which face modern reader-response criticism differ from the issues which confronted the first readers of Matthew. Today the relativization of values and the conversion of meaning into social and political effect pose intellectual problems of a metacritical order. When the Gospel of Matthew was written, the issues were different. Vital steps were being taken in the direction of matching Christian responsibility for decision and action with the ancient traditions of moral reflection and wisdom. The Gospel was extending a method of interpretation which already had a long history: the use of the Jesus tradition had been valued by early Christian communities alongside their own judgments. The role of the Old Testament in this process was being examined from Jewish and Gentile points of view. In the case of Matthew a further option was added: the parables as unveiling the nature and source of Christian responsibility. If our suggested model for the Gospel is accepted, new horizons were being offered to the first readers. The parables as unfinished stories were enabling different communities to work at the style of Christian life and behaviour.

Next we turn, in the second place, to the related subject of parables as deep structures. Structuralism has for some time been concerning itself with the deep structures of the text. The work of Greimas has attracted the interest of Via, Patte, Marin and many others to this field of enquiry, and a great deal of clarificatory work has been done on the hermeneutical implications of their work for study of the parables.[47] But from a historical-critical point of view the most productive studies of deep structures in the parables have come from those who have related the parabolic structures not only to the intratextual world of the parables but to their underlying life-world as well.

[47] Via, Patte, Marin, Greimas, Thiselton.

The deep structures are to be interpreted in the light of the world-view of those who tell and those who hear the stories. We shall look at two ways in which this has been attempted and at two false moves which have occurred in the process: the first attempts to describe the life-world implied in the imagery used; the second attempts to describe the life-world implied in the narratives used.

The imagery of the Matthean material can be approached in a number of ways. It can be approached using comparative material. In the case of some of the parables there is a great deal of comparative material, and it is useful to identify the life-world of the biblical material by contrasting the direction of the parabolic plots with the direction of extra-biblical plots. Treasure-trove stories abound, and the contrast between biblical and extra-biblical treasures stories provides some useful guidelines. The parable of *The Treasure* (Mt 13:44)[48] moves in a different direction from many of the treasure-trove stories; the Jesus parable does not move in the direction of litigation over the ownership of property, as some extra-biblical stories do, but in the direction of the miraculous nature of discovery. The comparative material points to the importance in the biblical material of 'discovery'. Discovery stories have an impact on human consciousness; they exercise a deep fascination upon us. That there is a correlation between the fascination of discovery and the life and work of Jesus is easy to accept. The unexpected and the surprising are elements common to the discovery story and to the Gospel account of people's encounter with Jesus. Structural study of the comparative material at that level relates to the structure of human perception and the capacity of the human psyche to respond. It hints similarly at the nature of human aspirations, greed and envy. They, as well as hope and trust, are part of our human response. They are part of the life-world of those who told and those who heard the stories.

The word 'treasure' has the power to evoke deep levels of perception, experience and potential. It operates in that way in many different cultures because of the nature of humanity and the relation of language to human life. It operates as an 'emblematic metaphor' because of the different word fields to which it belongs: literal (gem, pearl, gold) and transferred (value, person, history). It is parallel to the pattern which was noted in the study of the four summary parables, where words like 'rock' and 'foundation' operate as a centre of reference within the discourse.

One of the word fields which attracted attention early in the study of parabolic metaphor was 'growth'. The seed evoked a sense of wonder at the miracle of growth; within an Israelite agrarian culture it evoked the experiences of sowing in faith and receiving in abundance, with the

[48] See p.351.

associations of divine blessing and the privilege of cooperating with God. But the seed could also disappoint, and hunger could follow, and the question of divine displeasure arise. The parable of *The Sower* [49] belonged to that world of experience and drew its power in part from that world and from the interplay between the human and natural world which distinguished the ancient life-world from our own. In the teaching of Jesus the parable drew its power also from the association of seed and soil, from the contexts where seed and soil encourage growth and from those which disappoint.

The life reality of which the 'seed' was a part belonged with the realities of the New Testament experience and proclamation. In particular two word fields[50] became established as essential features of the New Testament message: the tree and its fruit, or its failure to produce fruit, with the respective associations of food and famine, life and destruction, and with the related pictures of figs and the season of fruit and vine, pruning and wine; and harvest and wheat and tares. The miracle of growth and the astonishing exuberance of growth, the varieties of soil and the various contexts for growth or failure became vital elements in the Christian story. The former shifted between corporate (Mt 15:13)[51] and individual reference points; the latter became particularly associated with the Kingdom (in contrast to the Old Testament associations) and with the life of the Christian church (encouraging allegorical developments such as Mk 4:13-20; Mt 13:24-30, 36-43). These New Testament word fields of judgment and community contrasted sharply with those of the contemporary world, where the transient character of life and growth filled a larger space. The New Testament imagery revealed its own distinctive life-world.

The headline summaries built from the metaphors of salt, light and the city (Mt 5:13-16)[52] introduce further aspects of the growth of the Matthean tradition. They announce that in the fulfilment of the Beatitudes God will be glorified throughout the world. In their universal aspect they correspond to the final 'parable' of the last of the discourses (25:31-46). 'You are the earth's salt' (5:13) has its parallel in Lk 14:34, but the Matthean reference to salt picks up the Marcan traditions also (see Mk 9:49-50a). 'You are the world's light' (5:14) has its parallel in Lk 11:33, but there, despite the Marcan parallel (Mk 4:21), Matthew remains closer to Luke. But most significant of all are the two logia which Matthew adds, on the city and on glorifying God, belonging to Matthean redaction and pre-Matthean traditions respectively. They evoke deep responses for the Jew as for the Gentile. They are part of the life-world of history and worship.

---

[49] See p.299.
[50] von Gemünden, *Vegetationsmetaphorik.*
[51] See p.370.
[52] See pp.360-362.

The Matthean resources for metaphor and simile provide an important insight into the world contemporary with the Gospel, but it is here that some have misread the evidence. The plethora of metaphor which characterizes the Sermon on the Mount has been attributed to the author of the Gospel and designated rabbinic, whereas it is best understood as the product of a long period of growth spanning Jewish and Hellenistic influences. This is an important distinction and throws light on the world-setting of the Matthean material. The attempts to attribute the wealth of imagery to the Matthean editor look less and less likely as the development of the Sermon is better understood. Goulder assembles lists of imagery under thirteen headings to show the intricacy and range of Matthean usage;[53] he suggests that the imagery is arranged, in doublets and in associations, in such a way as to indicate a mind at work ordering the material; and he applies a statistical test to argue on the grounds of this imagery that there cannot have been a common source behind the non-Marcan parts of Matthew. He compares with these findings a list of a hundred rabbinic parables, exhibiting a similar range of pictures and interests. Such pictures, he argues, are indicative of the life-setting of the author, a life-setting different from that of Mark and Luke.

Goulder's argument regarding the occurrence of imagery in the Sermon on the Mount is flawed because it depends on his vocabulary and stylistic analysis.[54] The same can be said of his argument about the arrangement and association of the Matthean imagery. The fundamental weakness in his argument appears when a similar study is carried out with regard to Epictetus's imagery. Epictetus can rival Matthew's range on orchards (Epict 3:22:35; 3:24:91; 4:1:117; 4:1:121; 4:8:34; 4:10:11,26), on animals (Epict 3:1:22; 3:24:6 ('crows and ravens'—a nice doublet); 4:1:25; 4:5:37; 4:11:2), on the town (3:13:19; 3:22:80,98; 4:7:19; 4:8:33), on crime and punishment (3:3:11; 3:7:11,35; 3:26:5; 4:1:91; 4:9:11), on all the other features, rites of passage, economic life, measures, domestic images, parts of the body, cosmic and country images. As in the case of Matthew, many of these pictures in Epictetus are used symbolically: the 'raven' (Epict *Ench* 18) is inauspicious, so are 'falling leaves' and 'figs' (3:24:91); the 'seed' growing secretly offers a paradigm of human growth (4:8:34-43); the 'fox' and the 'lion' form a pair representing different aspects of the life of a Socratic disciple (4:5:37). This last example is a Proverb, and the Proverbs agree with Epictetus in using animals, yokes, drunkards, eagles and doves, to name only a few, symbolically. It might seem strange that Matthew is so well endowed with imagery, but there is no reason why one tradition should

[53] Goulder, *Matthew*.
[54] See pp.8, 180.

not have given more attention to proverbial literature than another. There is no basic reason why some proverbial sayings in the Wisdom tradition should not go back to Jesus. Once accept proverbial groupings in some Wisdom sources and in the teaching of Jesus, and it is likely that the imagery in the sources will be unevenly distributed.

The fables too need to be introduced into the discussion. Their appearance across the ancient Near Eastern world is well documented (from the time of Jotham's parable onward), as was their use in the first century CE, when the fables of Aesop were basic educational material even among the peasantry. Matthew is no stranger to them (Mt 23:13; GThom Logia 39 and 102); nor were the rabbis. So when Goulder chooses his hundred rabbinic parables as a test of where the Matthean themes and subjects belong he isolates both rabbis and Matthew from the wider world to which they belonged. To fail to see the vocabulary and imagery in Matthew as shared with the Proverbs and fables is to lose an integral part of that world-view, and consequently to misunderstand it.

The popular imagery current in the first century is the backcloth against which the parables are to be heard. It is also the backcloth against which the relation between the parables and rabbinic imagery has to be assessed. The imagery is important but it is far from uniquely rabbinic. Pre-Matthean groupings of logia bring a host of imagery to bear upon divine providence (Mt 6:25-33/Lk 12:22-31) and upon 'hearing and doing God's will' (6:19-25/Lk 12:33-36, 16:13), and other pictures shared with Luke add to the profusion. Some of the imagery is biblical, some is from non-biblical contexts; they too suggest an overlap of rabbinic and Hellenistic parallels. The Proverbs, Wisdom sayings and picture sayings contribute to the total expression of a Sermon in which content and imagery interlace. It is hard to resist the impression that the Matthean writer is heir to a rich inheritance of imagery and is creative in using its potential. The retaining of groups of aphorisms within which the imagery operates with amazing subtlety makes the point well.[55] That inheritance is the context for any discussion of parabolic language in Matthew. Matthew is aware of the range of pictures within the Jesus tradition and their power and effectiveness within it.

It could well be that the Wisdom tradition has contributed to that riot of colour and increased the level of imagery numerically. Matthew's Gospel shows signs of that influence. It could also be that the influence of Hellenistic fables and stories has increased the store of figurative material. There are signs of that also in Matthew, although some dispute it. Some prefer the suggestion of Cynic influence.[56] Whatever those influences, and

[55] See Piper, *Wisdom*, 61-77.
[56] Downing, *Genre for Q*, 24.

whatever their contribution, it remains probable that behind the imagery is a creative source for that imagery in the Jesus tradition which the growth of the tradition in Matthew has accurately represented.

It is apparent that in the area of parable and imagery the attempts of scholars to work with literary techniques of copying and redaction are inappropriate for material that is essentially imaginative, attractive and interesting. Theissen is right when he insists that the network of influences to be found in the synoptic material needs to be evaluated both synchronically and diachronically. The interplay of memory and culture, of performance and tradition, of meeting and sharing, of inspiration and institutionalization is powerfully illustrated in this area of figurative material. It displays so much of the living world behind the text.

The life-world of the Matthean imagery cannot therefore be described in simple terms. The positioning of some of the imagery indicates an intention that traditional language should be heard with its strong resonances and wide-ranging associations, both Jewish and Hellenistic, with different word fields providing a rich resource of thought and reflection, moral and theological. The church context in which the language was heard provided particular preferences for the interpretation of some metaphor and imagery, and the New Testament gives evidence of those preferences. Matthew's Gospel reveals a tension between those two worlds. We have also to bear in mind that the imagery used in the parables does not reflect an urban setting. It is rich and wide-ranging, but it is limited by the contexts in which the tradition grew.

We turn now from the life-world beneath the text of the Matthean imagery to the life-world beneath the text of the Matthean narratives. Some parables have been described as historical allegories.[57] They present a view of history to which the structure of the narrative points. An important example of this is the parable of *The Tenants* (in its Matthean form Mt 21:33-41). Wright[58] has suggested that the parable has the following form: an initial sequence, three topical sequences and a final sequence. On that basis he declares the parable to be a presentation of the Jewish world-view, a world-view which has been given by Jesus a startling new twist. At its fundamental level it was the story of Israel's God, God's people and world, but the story was given in a new way. It was retold in a framework within a framework of the success of God's overall plan as contrasted with the failure of a particular set of agents. In this way the structure of the parable and the life-world of the text can be understood together.

---

[57] See pp.93-94.

[58] Wright, *Covenant.*

The historical character of some parables[59] gives strength to Wright's attempt to find the deeper structure of the text. Behind the story is Israel's history. But two questions arise about this method of parabolic interpretation: first, it is claimed that the method can illuminate both the plot and the relationships of the details of the story to the plot; second, it is claimed by inference that the solution works for all forms of that particular parable. These two points are both debatable. First, there is the question of the plot and the relationship of the details of the story to the plot. The detail of the parable of *The Tenants* is not so easily resolved in terms of the overall plot. A detail such as the killing of the son outside the vineyard (Mt 21:39/Lk 20:15/Diff Mk 12:8) can be explained in a number of ways, and the parallelism of that detail with the Passion Narrative in Matthew can hardly be excluded. It is a characteristic of Matthean parabolic narratives that they expand the story by the addition of details. In form-critical terms there are the Matthean epic parables which, as against the normal characteristic of the epic parable to restrict detail to the absolute minimum, add a few extra details inessential to the plot. These extended epic parables[60] relate to the epic parable as the similitude relates to the briefer picture saying.[61] The purpose of the extension seems only to be that the added detail offers more opportunity for the reader to exploit the text. It encourages an imaginative use of the parabolic detail. Seen against that background, the attempt to limit the meaning of parabolic detail to what is essential to the plot is to mistake the material's Gattung. Second, the world-view of this parable is not necessarily the same in the case of Matthew and Luke as it is in the case of Mark. The difficulty in claiming the same world-view for all three versions is evident from a comment on 21:43: according to Wright the 'new tenants' are to be a new group of Jews through whom God's purpose of bringing blessing to the Gentiles will be fulfilled. Wright identifies this as a Matthean world-view by using the same diagrammatic pattern for the narrative of Matthew's parable of *The Tenants* as for the narrative in Mark. But he fails to note that this contradicts one of the most obvious features of Matthew's story: that Jesus himself, according to Matthew, enabled Gentiles to see the light of life and in doing so fulfilled the promise of the Old Testament prophet that he would do so (Mt 4:12-16). The world-view has changed. The Matthean world-view differs from the Marcan. So, if the parable is in fact a historical allegory, the system by which the world-view has been identified from the structure of the Matthean parable has proved fallible. The deep structure of the parable of *The Tenants* can usefully be related to the world-view it represents, but that world-view cannot be read off

[59] See pp.97, 267, 270, 393, 402.
[60] See pp.224, 408, 422-423, 462, 481.
[61] See ch.2 p.87.

from the detail and the surface structure of the parable. As in the case of the imagery of Matthew, the total picture of the Gospel is essential if the world-view beneath the surface of the text is to be identified.

There is a further reflection on structuralist interpretation of the Matthean parables which follows from what has been said. If it is true that the detail of parables is not necessarily related to the plot of the parable, and if the world-view of a parable does not remain constant as it is retold, then the application of the Greimas structuralist system to Matthean parables in general is of dubious value. The Greimas structuralist system seeks a consistent picture and creates a consistent picture. But the Matthean parables are often the products of a lengthy tradition; the parable of *The Unforgiving Servant* is just such an example. It is an extended epic and serves its function in relation to its preceding material precisely because it is a complex tradition. Such parables cannot be reduced to a single plot to which every detail of the text relates. They cannot be reducd to a consistent pattern. If that is true of the individual parables, how much more so will that be the case in extended sections such as the Chapter of Parables,[62] where several parables have been linked together. Judged from that point of view, Marin's attempt to unravel the tangled skein of the Chapter by means of structuralist theory has serious limitations.

In terms of the modern interpreter seeking a consistent reading of a lengthy text the structuralist system has its attractions. Patte's work on Matthean parables demonstrates that well.[63] But our concern is with the original writer and the original audience. There the matter stands very differently. Aspects of human perception and psychology uncovered by structuralist systems will be as applicable to the original audience as to ourselves. But the world-view of the text is a much more subtle phenomenon which is identifiable only from the Gospel as a whole, and not securely from any one part of the whole, and certainly not from the study of one particular narrative structure.

In the fourth of our eight studies we turn to the wider questions of narrative in Matthew. What kind of relationship do story and Gospel, narrative and Kingdom have there? Already the summary parables have provided one kind of answer to that question. A structure for Matthew's Gospel which does not take account of the distinctive role of the discourses is inadequate. But the question of story and Gospel, narrative and Kingdom is wider and covers three particular fields: the character of parabolic narrative, the integration of parable and Gospel narrative, and the role of narrative in relation to the Kingdom.

---

62 See Marin, *Matthieu 13:1-23*.

63 See Patte, *Matthew*.

First we consider the character of the parabolic narrative. In some recent research on the Matthean parables it has been assumed that the relationship of the parabolic narrative to the Gospel is determined by a particular feature of the narrative which directs attention from the level of the narration to a different level; the character of a parable as narrated metaphor requires a feature which is out of phase with the narration as an ordinary sequence of events. The theory is associated with the work of Ricoeur and has been applied to several Matthean parables. One of the most detailed of these is by Puig i Tàrrech and discusses the parable of *The Ten Young Women* (Mt 25:1-13).[64] This narrative concerns the arrival of a bridegroom and the ceremony which greets him. As far as research can ascertain the original details of such a ceremony, it seems that a group of young women would have the privilege of accompanying the bridegroom, and that their responsibility would be discharged in that action. As maids of honour they are to carry lighted torches. The outcome of the narrative is that some of the group discharge their responsibility and some do not. The narrative in Mt 25:1-13 follows what may described as the normal sequence of events for such a ceremony. However, so the argument runs, at the critical moment of the bridegroom's arrival, some of the group find themselves without oil and without the means to obtain any. They expect to borrow oil from those who have some, but the latter refuse. So some of the group do not fulfil their responsibility because the others refuse to share their oil with them. The latter give as an excuse that if they did share the oil there would insufficient for their own purposes, and they too would be unable to fulfil their task. The point which marks departure from the normality is when the problem of the oil proves insurmountable. That is, so the argument runs, where the leap takes place from the level of a normal ceremony to the second level, the level of entry into the wedding feast of the Kingdom of God. The impossible position of the one group, invited to fulfil the task but unable to do so, brings into focus the position of those who are invited to associate themselves with the Kingdom of Heaven but find themselves unable to do so. The conversation between the two groups underlines this. There can be no half measures, as the well-provisioned group point out. The Kingdom faces everyone with a radical option. One's existence is at stake in the moment of opportunity.

However, the Matthean form of the story, argues Puig i Tàrrech, does not correspond exactly to that description. What has just been described assumes that this is how Jesus told the story, with the ceremony at the centre of the narrative. Matthew tells the story in a different way, with the bridegroom at the centre; the privilege is not of accompanying the bridegroom but that of

64 Armand Puig i Tàrrech, *Dix Vièrges*.

sharing with the bridegroom in the marriage feast. So the story culminates in the bridegroom's refusal to allow the five late arrivals to enter and in his disowning of that group. Correspondingly the one group becomes a wise group because they are prepared for the coming of the Kingdom, and the other foolish because they are not; and the wisdom of the one consists in the right kind of watchfulness, and the folly of the others in their lack of readiness. There is a shift within the Matthean story. But the shift is not a moment of departure from the level of the narrative. It is the result of adding into the parable yet other metaphors, that of 'sleep', here suggestive of death, the metaphor of the 'closed door', here suggestive of the bridegroom's judgment, and the metaphor of 'readiness', here suggestive of ethical awareness. So the Matthean story is about a church of the ready and the unready, a corpus mixtum, from whom one group (who act in accordance with justice) will be rewarded and the others (failing to do so) will be punished.

The most interesting feature of Puig i Tàrrech's reconstruction of the parable is that it depends on a particular definition of a parable: the parable is a narrated metaphor within which a point of extravagance or surprise marks the leap into another level of reference.[65] Behind that definition is the massive edifice of Ricoeur's philosophical work. Metaphor is the opening up of the world of our everyday experience to new possibilities, of a new world, of the Kingdom. The application of the metaphoric process to a narrative form occasions an existential event, parallel to that which confronted the parabolic interpreters of the New Hermeneutic. It is not identical with the work of the New Hermeneutic. The similarities are there but the difference lies in the need to work with the metaphorical narrative; only through working with that does the new self-understanding occur.

Puig i Tàrrech's decision as to what constitutes a parable is dependent on that philosophical judgment. A parable has this effect; this is what makes the effect possible; therefore that is what a parable is. But historically there are other options. There is, for example, the way in which a fable works. A fable is a narrative which may remain at the level of its normal reference from beginning to end. It does not have to include a point of surprise or extravagance. It depends for effectiveness on the recognition of its form, often because it is a story about animals, or on a statement additional to the story, sometimes explaining, sometimes creating an opportunity for reflection on the story. Or, and this is the case with the Matthean parable of *The Ten Young Women*, layers of metaphor appear within the narrative, opening up elements of the narrative, in the case of this parable revealing fresh insights into the nature of the Kingdom.

---

[65] See pp.98-100.

If there is a problem with Puig i Tàrrech's reading of *The Ten Young Women* because of its dependence on Ricoeur's definition of a parable, there is also another difficulty: it leaves a detail unexplained in the Matthean parable. The emphasis which was given earlier to the dialogue between the five wise and the five foolish women needs to be extended further; there is the final comment of the wise to the foolish: πορεύεσθε μᾶλλον πρὸς τοὺς πωλοῦντας καὶ ἀγοράσατε ἑαυταῖς. It is not the predicament of those without oil which causes surprise; it is the suggestion that they should go and buy oil from the retailers in the middle of the night. That the instruction was intended to be taken literally and not dismissively is shown by the fact that the foolish ones did indeed go off to buy oil. If there is a detail in the narrative which cries out for an explanation it is this, the recommendation to go to the retailers and buy oil for themselves. One possible explanation is that the phrase reminds the readers that good works are never gained second-hand. There is no merit to be gained from the saints of the past or the present. We stand before God in the light of our own behaviour. The interpretation of the passage is not certain, but it indicates how difficult it is in the case of this parable, as in the case of *The Tenants*, to align all the detail of Matthean parables to a single plot.

A classic illustration of a story which remains on a single level of narrative but which carries with it important theological reflections is the parable which follows Mt 25:1-13, the parable of *The Talents* (Mt 25:14-30).[66] The language of the narrative is rooted in Old Testament tradition. It says that before his departure a man allocated his possessions to his servants: ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν δύναμιν. The phrase evokes a 'harvest' context from Deuteronomy, according to which a farmer benefits both from divine generosity and from the use of the abilities which God has given. The events which follow are described so as to contrast the first two servants, who make good use of what they have been given, with the third servant, who buries his master's assets. The three dialogues with the master on his return provide the same contrast. Those who have used the opportunity well are rewarded in language which speaks of great joy. The third dialogue is different, although it too uses language evocatively. Using 'Wisdom' language the story contrasts two attitudes: the attitude of the third servant to his master, which is one of fear arising from his view of the master as hard-hearted and grasping; and the attitude of the master to the servant, which is that the servant has been lazy and unprofitable and deserves to go empty-handed. The level of the narrative is sustained throughout, but the choice of language hints at other levels of divinely given opportunity. It is not clear what those opportunities might be. Are they opportunities of service such

[66] See pp.470-472.

as the following parable, *The Sheep and the Goats*, describes? Or is at least one level of interpretation the practical level of the parable itself, the level of finance?[67] The parable would then include a probing of practical attitudes to the handling of money. Day-to-day decisions are a matter of real significance. Such decisions matter; and behind the practical decisions are attitudes of fundamental importance: attitudes to God, and questions about the true nature of God.

How then are the three parables to be understood? *The Ten Young Women*, *The Talents* and *The Sheep and the Goats* belong within a Matthean sequence which emphasizes the need to 'watch' (25:13) because the decisive moment is not yet known. The first of them is specifically headed τότε ὁμοιωθήσεται ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν. The Kingdom of Heaven in Matthew can be understood at many different levels,[68] but it has four main facets: first, an association of the Kingdom with the Father's will (7:21), so that the divine justice is at work countering wickedness, hypocrisy, injustice and hard-heartedness; second, the life and teaching of Jesus and his disciples are the focus of that conflict between the powers of evil and the divine power at work in the world; third, the ultimate validity of God's justice will be upheld in a universal fulfilment when the Son of Man will represent the Father; and fourth, the Father's will is realized in the obedience of those who commit themselves to the Kingdom (6:10). Within that framework the three parables—*The Ten Young Women* as a multi-layered narrative, *The Talents* fable-like and practical, and *The Sheep and the Goats* with its distinctive shape and universality—are a challenge to engage in that conflict, with the assurance that the final word rests with God in Christ, who is even now at work destroying injustice and reinstating goodness and mercy, despite all appearances to the contrary.[69] The practical levels of the parabolic narratives are the levels at which those who follow Christ must live and work; there is no alternative to that.

Tracing the Matthean material back from these three final parables, we find in the eschatological discourse three shorter parables: *The Two Servants*, *The Thief* and *The Fig Tree* (Mt 24:45-51; Mt 24:42-44; Mt 24:32-33).[70] *The Two Servants* promises final rejection for those who mishandle responsibilities and who show disrespect to their colleagues (v49). The quality of inner church relationships is hinted at several times in the Matthean material (18:31; 25:8-9), but recompense for the wicked will come at the end (Mt 13:29). *The Thief*, like the Noah pericope before it (24:37-41), stresses watchfulness; we do not know the time of the end. *The*

67 See Carter, *Households*.
68 Jones, *Matthew 18*, 447-463; also ch.4 p.199 n.88.
69 Soskice, *Metaphor*, 153.
70 See pp.425-442.

Fig Tree,[71] in almost literal agreement with the Marcan version, points forward to the coming harvest. The Matthean parables expand the Marcan conclusion, giving a sense of the extended time before the end, and interpreting 'watching' in practical terms. The character of the parabolic narrative varies significantly from one parable to another. Each needs to be understood both in its own terms and as incremental, adding to those before it.

The relation of parabolic narratives to the good news of the Kingdom can best be examined by continuing the earlier discussion of Matthew 19-21.[72] The first part of the Matthean version of the narrative (19:1–20:34) has distinctive nuances over against the Marcan (Mk 10:1-52). The cost of following Jesus is illustrated in both, but in Matthew the disciples are virtually displaced as models of discipleship by children. Within that general picture stands the parable of *The Workers* (Mt 20:1-16). Again it is introduced by a reference to the Kingdom of Heaven: ὁμοία γάρ ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀνθρώπῳ οἰκοδεσπότῃ. It is an epic narrative within which, as the story proceeds, the emphasis shifts to and fro. At its narrative level it concerns the confused expectations of the vineyard workers. There are disgruntled workers in v11, who are an image of the disciples who carp at the Son of Zebedee in 20:20-28. The order of payment, the last first, is one cause for annoyance. Another cause is the level of payment. All are paid the same, however long or short their period of employment. The troubled relationships are in reaction to what the employer claims is generous treatment of his employees (v15b). The whole narrative is an excellent example of a story which, in contrast with its rabbinic counterparts, continues to fascinate as a narrative long after its conclusion is reached: οὕτως ἔσονται οἱ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι καὶ οἱ πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι. The conclusion is very similar to the conclusion of the previous pericope. The parable might be said to be a commentary upon it, and upon its ambiguity. For in Mark or in Matthew the reversal of position, the first last and the last first, could be read as an affirmation of the disciples' self-sacrifice (Many who are last will be first) or as a qualification of it: 'But, nevertheless, many who are first will be last and last first.' If the parable of *The Workers* is a story of confused expectations, how does the parable relate to its context? It could be an exploration of how expectations are bound to be confused in the divine order of grace. Learning to live with such confusion of hopes is part of the secret of the Kingdom. Is there perhaps an early signal here of the confusion expressed in *The Sheep and the Goats*: 'when did we see you hungry...?' Or is the primary reference point the new role of

[71] See pp.426-427.
[72] See pp.113-114.

the Gentiles, who share with those of ancient religious pedigree the task of being God's chosen race to bring blessing to the world? Or is the parable seeking assent to the alternative pattern of household and social life resulting from and embodying the Kingdom? Once again there is no simple picture of the Kingdom. God's search for justice and blessing for all humanity in a world of injustice, greed and apathy cannot be achieved by means which all will approve. Some will approve of Mark's picture of a Jerusalem sacked and plundered. Some will approve of Matthew's picture of a Jerusalem once more honoured as a place of healing and where children sing (21:12-13). But within the confused expectations (20:22) there is one clear point of reference: the doing of the Father's will. The doing of God's will (9:29; 26:39), alongside the faith which can remove mountains (see the Cursing of the Fig Tree 21:18-22), provides the focus for the debates that follow (Mt 21). It is the people producing the fruits who inherit the vineyard (21:43) and who enjoy the wedding feast (22:1-14).

The relationship of the parables to the major section Matthew 19-25 is partly therefore one of illustration. The Kingdom is like a wedding feast (Mt 22:1-14).[73] But at a deeper level what is happening in those chapters is a reshaping of events in line with a disturbing new theological emphasis. The parables prove to be a disturbing influence, echoing questions and uncertainties and suggesting that little is certain or secure. The 'replacement' parables in chs. 21-22 underline this insecurity. Only the generosity of God and the reliability of God's justice remain secure, giving the assurance that the Son of Man, God's son and agent, who suffers and dies, will be raised and will take up his place of sovereignty and judgment (Mt 20:19,23).[74]

The relationship between the parables and the good news of the Kingdom changes from one part of the narrative to another. In the four discourses the parables summarize the teaching of Jesus as a challenge to responsibility before God. In Mt 12 they are a testimony that Jesus is God's agent. In Mt 19-25 they prepare those who wish a share in the Kingdom to face the unexpected and unpalatable consequences of serving God; God's generosity and justice will be a source of continual amazement and surprise. Within this variety of function there is no indication that the parables express either the nature of the Gospel or the self-awareness of Jesus to a degree which sets them apart from the rest of the Gospel or makes them the core of the Gospel message or the focus of all that happens. Like the prophetic dramas in the prophetic books, the parables are a part of the pattern of word, act, record and fulfilment by which the divine activity is recognized. One aspect cannot

---

[73] See p.411.

[74] See pp.270-273 on the dependability of the divine rule against the vulnerability of the powers of evil (12:25-37).

be given priority over the other. They belong together as signs of God's work.

The fifth of the seven studies begins with a related question: Do the parables encourage a reflective and discursive approach to personal and corporate responsibilities, and does that mean that the Gospel of Matthew is not as directive and manipulative as many commentators have assumed?

A good deal of evidence has been assembled to show that the Matthean parables enable the hearer or the reader to reflect on personal and corporate responsibilities. The particular contribution of the parables is a form which is conducive to such reflection. Narrative offers the freedom to think, to change one's mind, and to form a fresh decision. Narrative is space and time; it is the leisure to listen and in attention to allow new associations of ideas and concepts to form. Narrative captures emotions; it images our attitudes, our fears and hopes. Narrative makes a distinctive contribution to the process of reflection. However, on the whole, the evidence suggests that parables are only a part of such a process of reflection. For example, we have considered the relation of the parable of *The Unforgiving Servant* to the disciplinary procedures in 18:15-17, and recognized that the whole of the second half of Mt 18 is part of a profound tradition of reflection on Lev 19:17-18. The parable should not be isolated from the preceding logia; it contributes some, but only some, of the facets which are appropriate to a community's attempt to understand and fulfil that part of the Law. One of the key facets of that reflection, the need for the heart to be free from recriminations and prejudice and to offer forgiveness which is genuine and wholehearted (18:35), is only loosely attached to the parable. It is true that the parable is concerned with a personal genuineness which accepts the integrity of forgiving when once forgiven, but that is only a part of what is implied in forgiving your brother: ἀπὸ τῶν καρδίων ὑμῶν. The reflective elements are widely spread across Mt 18, and one of those key elements is the logion 18:35.

Stories provide room for reflection, but they are not free from cultural values. The Matthean parables reflect the courtly life of authoritarian rulers, the rich aristocracy which punishes those who do not humour them (22:7), and the employer who exercises a capitalist control over labour.[75] Above all, several of the parables are parables of the Kingdom, and Kingdom is a symbol for manipulative control. A woman appears in 13:33, and she is in the role of a housewife; the story reinforces that view of a woman's status and role. The parables are by no means free from repressive tendencies. The

[75] The modern term 'capitalism' does not fit some features of the ancient economy, as it fails to do justice to aspects of modern economies where small-holdings are retained and give a modicum of independence over against state control.

moral values hidden in the word σκάνδαλα (13:41) were exposed in Chapter One,[76] and parallel to σκάνδαλα is ἀνομία, the threat of lawlessness, a word expressive of the fear that society could disintegrate. Those who represent such challenges to society will be exterminated (13:42). The constant representations of judgment are lurid and frightening, however they are to be understood.

So the argument cannot be that parables are free from ideology and cultural values. That can hardly be true of any set of stories. What parables can do is to assist the spread of subversive attitudes: the first will be last and the last first; those who are confident of their status or of their righteousness are made insecure; the disciple is humbled by a child; the one who is to be judge of all is himself the victim of injustice.

In the end it is not narratives which are the best defence against ideology, even though they can be deconstructed and reconstructed. The best defence against ideology, as we saw earlier, is, first, the establishing of networks of concepts by means of which rational debate can reflect critically on values and attitudes (as is the case in 18:35). Matthew goes some way to achieving that. The Wisdom terminology of the Sermon on the Mount established a learning mode (the Beatitudes). The key concepts of justice and mercy are deployed in different relationships. Legal statements are examined by means of particular cases (the Antitheses).[77] Authority is shown to be benign. In chs. 19-20, a context which encourages and makes possible justice and mercy, the reflection on household and society standards is studded with reflective language which, in a similar way to chs. 5-7, underlines the principles of justice and mercy. As in chs. 5-7, language is used which is familiar to both Jews and Gentiles; it suggests that those principles should result for both Jewish and Gentile readers in alternative social structures and relationships. Such alternative structures will be costly, but the cost is part of the price of the good news of the Kingdom[78] and part of the search for what guides human history.

Parables cannot operate as a critique of society and religion apart from conceptual systems of analysis and experimental action, but they nevertheless encourage discursive thought and discourage the worst forms of legalism. They also, like the parable of *The Treasure*, retain the possibility that insight and understanding can be undeserved gifts as well as hard-won achievements. Coming from different sources and traditions they symbolize the act of listening, so that their use represents shared rather than imposed learning. They are not instruments of instruction; they are distributors of

---

[76] See p.17 n.18.

[77] See ch.2 p.104.

[78] Carter, *Households*, ch. 7, discusses this issue but assumes that the creation of alternative structures would not be possible.

insight, invitations to assent and opportunities for mutual commitment. In sum, the parables not only encourage reflection, they undermine rather than support ideologies; they instantiate that aspect of authority which encourages and facilitates the response of obedience; they establish conversation in a social context where the values to be confirmed by Christ can be celebrated.

The sixth of the seven studies concerns sociological theory and the Gospel. Sociological theories have led to divergent interpretations of Matthew's Gospel, and it is useful to review these divergences in the light of the Matthean parables. The debate centres on three main subjects: the background of Matthew in relation to Judaism, the structure and organization of the Matthean church, and the nature of society contemporary with Matthew.

The relation of Matthew to Judaism has been described sociologically in terms of three theories.[79] The first, the social-identity theory, examines the role of cognition in group formation and underlines the strength and permanence of group identification in ancient society; to be a member of Israel, a follower of Jesus, a member of the Kingdom of God, will lead to particular norms, goals, beliefs and behaviour patterns. The second, realistic conflict theory, examines the affiliations which take place to meet human need for benefits and rewards; although this theory is usually applied to financial or material needs and rewards, in the case of Matthew this could apply to transcendent needs and rewards. The third, deviancy theory, attempts to understand the tensions within the relationship of competing groups who regard each other as deviant. The competing groups may be entirely separate and relate as majority or minority movements within society. But competing groups may belong to a parent body and be struggling to make an impact on the parent body or to achieve change within it. These three theories have been used to suggest how the Matthean use of ἐκκλησία is to be understood, and how the references to 'their/your synagogues' are to be understood. They have been used to answer questions such as: if Judaism is the majority group, what does it mean that Matthew uses those terms? On one side a key question is whether Matthew sees the ἐκκλησία as part of Judaism or as separate from Judaism. On the other a key question is whether Judaism should be seen as a unit, or as itself made up of competing groups.

Recent developments in the understanding of post-70 CE Judaism have concentrated on the struggle during that period between competing groups: the coalition of rabbis who survived the war with Rome and who were seeking a new way of expressing their religion in terms of sacrifice and priestly purity; apocalyptic and millenarian groups reflecting a pessimism

[79] Saldarini, *Community*, ch. 5.

about the world and looking for signs of imminent divine retribution on the idolatry and injustice of those who exercise political power; revolutionary movements, reformist, charismatic and baptist movements. The struggle continued at many levels: leadership battles, theological conflicts, community definition, issues of practice in relation to the Law, organization and buildings.[80] The levels of control and discipline differed from place to place and from group to group as part of the dynamics of the struggle.

Given that diversity, how did Matthew's ἐκκλησία relate to it? One theory takes the view that Matthew was constructing a story based on the person of Jesus to enable a Jewish Jesus-movement to establish its own identity within Judaism and to confront opposing views of what should be normative in Judaism.[81] This alternative community, modelled on a household and meeting in a private house, so the theory goes, would have been understood in Graeco-Roman society as a private voluntary association. Committed to a programme of change, it would have attempted to bring Gentiles into association with Israel. In evaluating that theory the parables have vital evidence to offer.

The four 'summary parables' provide complementary evidence that the rabbinic links are strong but that Matthew's ἐκκλησία includes a variety of groups within which Jew and Gentile stand on an equal footing. Mt 7:24-27 illustrates the rabbinic connections of Matthew; 13:52 accepts but qualifies the scribe's position; 18:23-35 gives the Matthean ἐκκλησία a self-identity which is being achieved across several geographically separate communities by means of a similar organization and ethos; and 25:31-45 presents a confident universal claim which is as relevant to Gentiles as to Jews, and undermines any claim to a special status for the Jew. Each of these points needs clarification and amplification.

Mt 7:24-27 is a geminate parable. The resemblance between that parable and a parable of ben Abuyah provides a starting-point. The resemblance between those two parables involves their internal organization by means of balancing phrases, and also the degree to which both are internally organized, balanced phrase for phrase, and committed to repetition. Luke's version of the parable of *The Two Houses* has a low level of internal organization; its second half prefers variation to repetition. Matthew's parable in terms of its construction is much closer to the ben Abuyah parallel than the Lucan is. Between Mt 7:24-27 and the ben Abuyah parallel there are also differences, three in particular: Mt 7:24-27 has poetic folk imagery, dramatic impact and a characteristically Matthean Wisdom contrast. In these respects the Matthean parable approximates to the fable; and like

[80] Overman, *Formative Judaism*; Kee, *Origins*; Trebilco, *Communities*.
[81] Saldarini, *Community*.

the fable can be considered on two separate levels, the level of narrative and the level of interpretation. One further resemblance between *The Two Houses* and ben Abuyah's parable is that each is related to a twofold logion, of which the two parts are identical in structure and are distinguished only by virtue of the positive–negative form of their statements. This resemblance applies to both versions of *The Two Houses*, to the Lucan and to the Matthean. So to that extent there is a link between the ben Abuyah parallel and the Q version of *The Two Houses*. The resemblance extends also to the metaphor, the 'building' metaphor which has roots in Jewish, Hellenistic and early Christian traditions.

This parallel between the ben Abuyah parable and *The Two Houses* is hard to evaluate. It is a matter of trying to compare a first-century CE tradition, *The Two Houses*, known from two first-century CE texts, Matthew and Luke, and whose relationship can be roughly defined, with a second-century CE tradition, the ben Abuyah parable, known from two late second-century CE texts, whose relationship has not yet satisfactorily been defined.[82] An analysis of the rabbinic meshalim makes it possible to identify the distinctiveness of the geminate form,[83] and it is the

[82] The comparison is only possible on the basis of Johnston's work. He isolates the narrative meshalim, meshalim strictly so designated by the use of an explicit label, an abbreviated label, or special formulae (such as generalized situations) or distinctive internal structure (i.e. he is using a criterion for defining a rabbinic parable which is morphological, not functional). He uses a form-critical approach in dependence on the work of Neusner, relating (as Neusner does) the transmission of material to rabbinic generations. The result of this method enables Johnston to correct Neusner's judgment that 'Pharisaic-rabbinic traditions contain few, if any parables (these are all late)' by adducing several cases of less stereotyped parables attributable to the first generation of the Tannaim. There are seven other parables: 1) Lev R 34:3 has a structured narrative, but a narrative only at the Yavnean stage fully structured and provided with a Hillel attribution and Prov 11:17 reference; 2) ARN^A 15:3 is said by Johnston to approximate to the classical rabbinic mashal, but the approximation is more difficult in the parallel ARN^B 29 (Saldarini); 3) Gen R 1:15 has parallels, e.g. in bHag 2.1(12a), where the Hillel–Shammaic controversy is recorded first of all without parabolic references; 4) bShab 153a is the Yohanan ben Zakkai parable of the Royal Banquet (with the wise–foolish distinction in three parts), absent from the same context in Qohelet Rabbah 9:8; 5) Gen R 19:6 is the cut-glass parable which may be attributable to Rabbi Aqiba; 6) ARN^A14 is metaphor rather than parable; and 7) Mek Shir 3:28-39 is of uncertain attribution. The evidence is nicely balanced: Eliezer ben Hyrcanus II is rarely linked with parables, yet, according to Johnston, no parables are attributed to Amoraim in Mekilta. Of these seven, bShab 153a is valuable datable evidence (although not necessarily for its style and language); the others in various degrees are less so.

[83] If Johnston's specifically 'mashal classification' is criticized as methodologically too narrow, two other groups would require attention: the

distinctiveness of the geminate form which provides our starting-point. Johnston describes the geminate form as follows: 'In the truly geminate parable, first one subject is paraded onto the stage, dressed in white or black; and then the second subject, identical to the first in all things except for being dressed in the opposite colour, is brought on after the exit of the first. The audience is asked to vote its approval for one or the other in a choice thus rendered as easy as possible to make.' Another example of this distinctive form is Pirke Aboth 3:21 (Herford edition), the parable of *The Tree. The Tree* is a 'geminate parable' based on a debate concerning the relative merits of study and action (see Pirke Aboth 3:11, Herford edition) and therefore is probably part of the debate leading up to the Tarfon–Yohanan–Aqiba controversy. That particular 'geminate parable' has its roots in the twofold 'positive–negative' logion (see Pirke Aboth 3:12) and the Wisdom simile (see Pirke Aboth 1:3) attributed to Antigonus of Soko.[84]

---

moral story and the ma^{c}aseh. Neusner classifies sixteen sections as moral stories: Sifre Num. 22, an anomalous story against pride, in the distinctive anecdotal style which only implies a relation to the opening statement and does not specify it; bBB 133b contains a catena of traditional motifs with an apothegmatic ending; Gen R 65:22 is a dramatic discussion on reward and punishment, with a concluding vision; jBer 7:2 is an extended dialogue concerning the honour brought by Torah; jBM 2:5 is probably late fiction; bYoma 71b is a brief secondary form of an anti-priestly saying; bBer 29a has only late citations; bTa 23b is an anonymous baraita narrative; Tos Sot 13:3 may be a compilation from the Bar Kokhba War at Usha and concerns logia rather than narrative; jBer 9:3 similarly is a logion; bYoma 35b is part of baraita concerning study of the Torah by rich and poor; ARN^{A}12 includes the introductory saying 'According to the Painstaking, the Reward' within a dialogue; bShab 30b-31a are four dialogue narratives, virtually undatable; bNed 66b is a composite pericope on obedience to husbands; bBB 4a concerns the building of the Temple, with little sign of historical accuracy. Together they provide very little early evidence of narrative form and style at the time of the Temple's destruction. The ma^{c}aseh is well attested for Gamaliel and Tarfon among the Masters, and is characterized by a highly formalized schema, which retains its currency late on into the tradition and is a feature also of the earlier tradition, although probably not of its original form. The function of this form for reporting legal decisions makes it less important for our particular enquiry, as does its highly stylized narrative content.

[84] Whether Johnston is correct regarding the function of this parable is less certain. His judgment seems to be influenced by the Old Testament parabolic use (see Jotham's fable: Judges 9:6-21; and Nathan's parable: 2 Sam 12:1-15). The prophetic element is present in the 'geminate parable', but the function of the geminate form is to stimulate consistent moral discussion; it generates the concern and seriousness suited to the Wisdom tradition, rather than primarily, or only, to gain the audience's initial approval for a course of action. The parable of *The Married Woman* (Tos Kid 1:11) fits this function admirably, as do the texts of Mt 21:28-32 (in two of its possible versions) and Mt 7:24-27, although

The 'geminate parable' has a threefold importance for our study of *The Two Houses*. First, the form has a distinctive, antithetical, compact style. Second, it appears within a discussion of critical importance which is datable in terms of the history of Judaism. Third, it represents a crystallization of the Wisdom tradition. This enables us to make the judgment that the Matthean form of *The Two Houses* could belong with Pirke Aboth 3:21ff and ARN^A 24 (ARN^B 35) as part of a crystallization of the 'Wisdom' tradition. The 'Wisdom' stage would then correspond to the Q form of *The Two Houses,* and the later geminate form to the Matthean or Q Matthean stage.

As against the compactness of this geminate form with its tightly organized antithetical style, the style of the early narrative rabbinic parable is less easy to define. There is no secure way of fixing the wording of any extended first-century narration,[85] and the later evidence of the epic form is found in Greek, Hebrew and Aramaic. A common epic form shared by Matthew and the rabbis need not have been tied to a particular language. But such a common style cannot be dated and there is no extant example of the rabbinic 'epic' parable before the known version of the ben Zakkai parable. There were narrative parables in the earlier period. Like the early 'Wisdom' parables they used the classic themes of house, feast, master, king and pearl. In some of these, elements of the epic narrative were present. For example, Epictetus 3.22:2-4 is a miniature epic narrative, with variation, assonance and phrased sentences; its theme is 'the house'. So Flusser may be correct when he suggests that in the first century CE there was a confluence of ethical and Wisdom traditions to which Jesus and the rabbis were heirs and which they adapted for their own purposes. In the earlier period there were also extended narratives, characterized by economy of language, organization, structure and balance. Aesop's fable of *The Eagle and the Fox* has similarities with Mt 18:23-35. Both are narratives in three sections, with the structural use of the Genitive Absolute to mark the sections. Both use Adverbial Participles, assonance and onomatopoeia. But the fable has a rolling, consecutive narrative style, with longer phrases and greater resource of vocabulary and construction. Mt 18:23-35 uses language that is tightly organized, with balanced phrases of similar length. It is, at least in part, 'epic' in style.

---

in 7:24-27 the 'prophetic element' may have been stronger in earlier forms of the tradition.

[85] Fiebig considered bSab 153a and Qoh R 3:9 and noted in them the four distinctive features of the epic parable which appear in the Greek of the Matthean epic parables (organization, repetition and variation, assonance and phrased sentences). He argued that they appear in comparable form in both Hebrew and Aramaic.

While it is useful to designate Mt 7:24-27 as a 'geminate' form and Mt 18:23-35 as an 'epic' parable, it is significant that in neither case are these pure forms. 7:24-27 exhibits variations on the basic form. The Matthean form has exactly balancing parts, alliteration, recurrent phrase lengths and rhythm. But features of its language, its emblematic metaphor, its associated fields of reference, its drama, its cross-references to the Sermon on the Mount and its resemblance to a prophetic oracle of judgment mark a shift of Gattung from that of a 'geminate parable' to that of a 'summary parable'. Mt 18:23-35 similarly, although it has a triple form and an 'epic' style in its first two parts, has a third section which is different in style, with cross-references to the Sermon on the Mount and to other parts of Mt 18. It too has shifted to the Gattung of a 'summary parable'.

What are we to conclude from these parallels with rabbinic material? What can be said about the milieu of these Matthean summary parables? Certainly we cannot date the forms. The features of the geminate parable are very distinctive, and the appearance of exactly balancing structures in both Mt 7:24-27 and ben Abuyah does suggest a tradition shared within a limited time and geographical area but not one which was more generally available. The comparison points to a common milieu, if not to a specific date and time. The geminate parable and the epic parable both represent figurative and parabolic material involving a high degree of structural organization and they could be part of a history which in rabbinic terms can be traced over several decades.

The milieu was at one time defined in relation to the Council of Yavneh. W.D. Davies originally took the view that the formulation of the Sermon on the Mount could be seen as a counterpart to the work of Yavneh. The approximation of Eliezer ben Hyrcanus's agenda to Mt 5:33-37 on 'swearing' and to Mt 6:25-33 on 'worry' was regarded as corroborative evidence for this. Now, however, the role of Yavneh and the details of its development are differently interpreted. Other features too within Davies's case render the theory unreliable. His view that the triadic form of the Sermon paralleled the ben Zakkai triad must be judged dubious.[86] Alongside

[86] Alongside a careful analysis of the text of the Matthean Sermon, Davies adduced two main arguments for his thesis: the triple form of the Sermon as a response to ben Zakkai's famous triad, and the approximation of the Matthean Lord's Prayer to the Abbreviations of the Eighteen Benedictions. Neither is particularly strong. If there is a triadic arrangement in the Sermon (based on Torah, Cult and Society) the evidence for this as a redactional shaping of the material is at best circumstantial. The crucial seam is between the second and third of those proposed sections at 6:19, and of the potentially redactional language in 6:19-21 there is only one sign and that is shared here with Luke. If, as Davies concedes, we cannot be sure whether or not the Lord's Prayer formed part of the Cult Didache, then the case for ascribing a division between 8:1-18

this otherwise unconvincing material the coincidence in 7:24-27 of Matthean and Yavnean interests cannot be taken as dating their common milieu.

Even among the Matthean parables Mt 7:24-27 is distinctive. The only other Matthean parable which approximates to the style of 7:24-27 is the parable of *The Two Sons*, Mt 21:28-31, and possibly 24:45-51. The language in 21:28-31 is crisp; it has two sections which balance each other in language, rhythm and sentence length; it sets out two contrasting situations, although the form of the contrast is uncertain because of massive text-critical problems.[87] It lacks the metaphorical power and dramatic impact of 7:24-27, and whereas 7:24-27 concludes the Sermon on the Mount and once concluded a pre-Matthean group of sayings, 21:28-32 was originally a parable linked to the Q tradition and seems then to have been incorporated into a parabolic collection involving Marcan material. 24:45-51 has the same style, contrasts and balances as 7:24-27, but was created from material with a different basic shape.[88]

It is hard to provide a precise date and place for the milieu of 7:24-27 for another reason: the mobility of rabbinic teachers. They were active, employing their narrative and parabolic material wherever they went. The pattern of their movements in the Antioch area is described in Deut R 4:8. Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Joshua are said to have taught there, and according to Lev R 5:4 Rabbi Aqiba accompanied them. They travelled around collecting funds, remaining in a single place for several days before moving on. Their travel in the Syrian area was proverbial. So it can be assumed that their stories and narrative styles would have been disseminated widely, especially if they used the ancient form of connected narratives and parables. Given those circumstances it would be virtually impossible to give a date and place to material such as Mt 7:24-27.

What then can we say about the sociological implications of Mt 7:24-27 and 18:23-35? Let us suppose that the Matthean church was a tiny social group within a Jewish orbit of influence. A minority group under propaganda or missionary pressure from larger organizations can close in on itself, especially within an urban environment. That is not the impression given by these two parables. They point fairly decisively in the direction of the challenges and possibilities of the world around. That is hinted at by the rhetorical character of 7:24-27. The narration has a popular flavour and

---

and 6:19ff to redactional activity is still weaker. In any case the Lord's Prayer is a brief text on which to hand so substantial a hypothesis, and the approximation of the prayer to the Abbreviation of the Eighteen Benedictions is not particularly close.

[87] See p.394.

[88] See pp.433-435.

incorporates folk motifs. Its likely setting is spoken narration as part of Christian worship, and no doubt rhetoric cemented social groupings within Christian assemblies to an extent which we would find unusual today. The rhetorical character of 7:24-27 also points outward into popular, urban culture.[89] It suggests universal claims for the one who tells the story and it sums up the confidence expressed within the Sermon on the Mount that God's wisdom and providence is always to be trusted.

If 7:24-27 harmonizes with the milieu of the travelling rabbis, 13:52 points in a slightly different direction. 13:52 provides a symbolic riddling conclusion, ending a discourse built on Marcan and Q material and on the revelation of God's Servant–Son. The riddle concentrates on the scribe. Perhaps for some of Matthew's hearers the position of the scribe would be open to question, and for others it would be a sine qua non for the exposition of Scripture and of Christian belief. In that setting, 13:52 would be a via media, asking about the scribe's place in the service of the Kingdom, and about the relationship of new and old forms of authority.[90] The positive reference to the scribe in 13:52 argues that there were scribes within the Christian community; it is also a reminder of the basic principles on which the Marcan and Q material are agreed. It is not only the old that guides belief and behaviour, whether the 'old' is taken as the Law or as the tradition or as authority; it is the new, especially the newly given interpretation and fulfilment of the Law in Jesus Christ, made available and effective within the communities which own his name.

An essential feature of the scribe's work was devotion to the Law, and that required the time and the opportunity for study, meditation and exploration. The level of professionalism and of commitment involved in the reference to a 'scribe' in 13:52 cannot be known for certain. But meditation, study, travel, gathering of material must be assumed as basic qualifications.[91] Mt 13:52 requires us to add to those activities yet another: the scribe needs to become a disciple to the Kingdom of Heaven. It is of course possible that 13:52 suggests an ideal of discipleship which all should seek. Everyone should be committed to following the way of discipleship, to receiving the divine gift of revealed truth and to understanding the fulfilment of the Law realized in Jesus Christ. But it is equally possible that 13:52 is a riddle which has at its centre the particular functions and activities of the Christian scribe, teasing everyone who reads it into reflection on the parallel responsibilities of all disciples.

One of the great advantages of that second solution is that it assumes the existence of a small group who could have been responsible for one of the

[89] See pp.187 n.51, 188.
[90] See below and pp.204-206, 208.
[91] See Orton, *Scribe*, chs. 2 and 3.

perplexing features of Matthew's Gospel. The so-called Formula Quotations appear to have been formed through careful collation, assimilation and interpretation of biblical texts, as these were brought into new and creative relationships with the Jesus tradition. They provide an important resource in the formation of the Birth Narratives and the Passion Narratives in particular. While it is not impossible that such a task might have been performed by a single individual, the more we understand the process behind the formulation of the fulfilment quotations the more likely it seems that more than one person would have been involved.[92] Perhaps the theory of a Matthean school responsible for the quotations is overdrawn,[93] but the careful, technical work on translation variants and traditions involved in the formulation of Old Testament fulfilment sayings suggests a network of scholarly, scribal work. It also suggests that some Christian scribes were dependent on that network and made their own distinctive contribution to it.

13:52 was therefore opening up a place for the distinctive and, for some, controversial role of the scribe within the Christian orbit,[94] and was doing so on grounds which were of general interest. All have responsibilities parallel to those of the scribes; they could be drawing together old and new, familiar and unfamiliar. If this is so, the implications of the verse are wide-ranging. Matthew was commending scribal activity, and as part of that, commending the drawing together of traditions from different sources. This was Matthew's own practice, combining different traditions within a single Gospel. Those among the audience who were accustomed to the Marcan tradition as their main Gospel material were presented in ch. 13 with a different Christian style of understanding and living. Old and new were side by side. Some no doubt found 13:52 a riddle which they did not wish to solve; it raised issues they did not wish to face. For others it provided a stimulus to make new discoveries.

It is of course possible that the sharing of materials to which we have referred could have created a changing climate, a climate such as that to which Justin, for example, contributed by linking together Jewish and Christian concerns. In that changing climate, communities which had been happy to sustain the traditions which they had received, listened to what others had to offer. Even tiny minorities, such as the Christian presence in the Antiochene area, could have been capable of that, given the new conditions which existed in Syria in the period after the Jewish War. Mt 13:52 points to that possibility. Even if some parts of the Jesus movement, as perhaps the scribes may have done, remained within Judaism, the encouragement to share parts of the Jesus tradition with others would have

[92] See pp.10 n.6, 195-198, 283-286.
[93] Stendahl, *School*.
[94] Brown, *Death*, II 1426.

produced a new situation. They would have discovered the value of presenting treasures new and old. No doubt there were groups of Christians who feared the competition with Judaism and its leaders. In such a context 'the new' could have caused insecurity, fear and resentment. For Gentile adherents the presence of scribal authority and influence could have been a cause of suspicion and anxiety. The symbolic words καινὰ καὶ παλαιά could have triggered a range of responses. One of the problems with the deviancy theory with which this section began is that it can begin with the assumption that only one set of relationships obtains in a particular area. As we have seen, that may well not have been the case in the communities which Matthew knew. The Jesus-movement had several decades of history behind it and had developed in many different ways. A single set of reactions would be highly unlikely.

13:52 can of course be explained in terms of its wider context, especially Mt 13:35 and Mt 13:18-23. Those passages indicate that parables can be the basis from which the revelation of divine mysteries can arise. The interpretations can also promote new patterns of behaviour. For some of Matthew's hearers the challenge of 'the new' confronted them, as we shall see, with norms of Christian life and faith which were foreign and disturbing. For some the parables challenged contemporary culture, the relationships between slaves and masters, the relationships between peasants and the ruling class. For these the 'new' elements emerging from the tradition were 'new' in the revolutionary quality of their values. Not all would have responded to the Matthean parables so positively. Much would have depended on the hearers' place in society. Slaves would have reacted violently to some of the stories and no doubt have made their disapproval known.

Such a situation presented dangers. There was the danger of introducing potentially divisive ideas into communities at peace with their own style of life and work. There was the danger of using new material to control and direct the hearers, and to impose on them an understanding of Christology and ecclesiology personal to the author. How Matthew handled that danger will appear from 18:21-35 and 25:31-45.

A favourable reaction to the association of the Marcan and the Q traditions could not have been achieved without changes of attitude, and the final parable of ch. 18, as the Gospel writer uses it, commends self-criticism. Such an approach could expedite change. The chapter accepts the ancient Jewish tradition of mutual community responsibility, incorporating as part of that process features of the Hellenistic Jewish moral tradition.[95] The main problem which the chapter faces is how to translate the need for

[95] e.g. pp.22-24.

reproof and forgiveness into the human dynamics of community life. That had been the issue for Jewish communities for generations. The Hellenistic Jewish moral tradition brought the issue to a significant point of resolution. It accepted that forgiveness was an essential for community life, but it stressed that this had to be a forgiveness 'from the heart'. Forgiveness was the only secure foundation for future work, but it had to be a forgiveness purified by inner integrity. It required a proper self-criticism; criticism of others would only ever be right when the critic was acting in conscious integrity.

Matthew's hearers acquainted only with the Marcan tradition would have found the initial stages of the new discourse in ch. 18 entirely appropriate. If, however, they were unused to the community pattern of discipline in 18:15-17, they may well have found the recommended process an unacceptable innovation, perhaps a challenge to their view of authority. Those acquainted only with the Q tradition might similarly have found the notion of excluding members of the community and blackening their character with epithets like ἐθνικὸς καὶ τελώνης (Mt 18:17) unacceptable, and out of keeping with their understanding of the Christian faith and practice. The role of Mt 18:20 too should not be underestimated. It speaks of small groups of Christians, who are part of the ἐκκλησία, and who have in common the presence of Christ, meeting in different places. Like those who meditate on the Torah and know that the presence of God is among them, the same is true for those who address the Father in prayer (18:19). The importance of the parable at the end of the chapter is therefore this. It offers a response to the initial question, 'Who is the greatest?' It commends humility in the form of a child. It presents the values of mercifulness and humanity in a parabolic form. By means of the four additional words it commends new attitudes to suit the situation. In sum, the parable functions as tradition reformed to inaugurate change.

It is in a cosmopolitan city that the parable of *The Sheep and the Goats* seems most at home. It adapts the apocalyptic tradition of a Judgment[96] Vision to a universally acceptable morality, so that the Final Judgment is morally justifiable. No one can claim to be ignorant of the terms on which the judgment is to be made. No doubt the wandering preacher could proclaim an apocalyptic message of salvation for the chosen, and destruction for the world, without an awareness of the moral problem involved in the message. Not so the city-dweller, who lived alongside a pagan neighbour and for whom the problem of refugees arriving in the neighbourhood would have been a regular experience. Sooner or later for a person in that environment the question was bound to arise: 'By what standards is my neighbour to be

[96] See pp.241-243.

judged?' Mt 25:31-46 provides an answer and it is an answer which can be understood among Jews and among Gentiles.[97]

If the standards are the same for all, they are the same for all, Christian or non-Christian. The parable introduces into the apocalyptic tradition a fresh recognition of Christian responsibility. Far from 'waiting for the end', the Christian will be judged by the standard of individual care and service. All, Christian and non-Christian, will be judged by that standard. In that recognition a change in the apocalyptic world-view has taken place.

If the parable is uncompromising and radical in the standards of judgment it presents, it is comforting in its presentation of the one who is to judge. To a small group of Christians, living in disparate communities, sensitive to the enormous pressures of the state and dwarfed by the powerful political struggles within it, incensed at the worship which power attracts, the parable offers a judge who is one with the oppressed because he was one of the oppressed, and who judges as he does because of who he was and is. To that extent 25:31-46 does not offer an apocalyptic Christology. As Chrysostom recognized,[98] the parable offers a Lord whose eternal suffering in and with the innocent sufferers of the world inaugurates a world revolution of the most fundamental kind.

In so far as the parable challenges a millenarian apocalypticism it is continuing the moral challenge made against some forms of apocalyptic by the traditions in Mt 13 and Mt 24-25. Mt 25:31-46 stands in continuity with the tradition which the redactor inherits, and what is said in 25:31-46 is a legitimate development of it. It is legitimate, because it brings the Jesus tradition with its affirmation of 'love toward the enemy' together with the same affirmation found in non-Jewish contexts; it joins them in a testimony to the Son of Man's authority. In this way 25:31-46 brings to a climax the contribution of the summary parables, by offering a common basis for Jew and Gentile. It is no longer Judaism which has the privilege of attracting Gentiles to the true faith. Both stand on the same footing before the universal God and his Christ.[99]

Matthean opposition to Judaism, one of the key factors in the deviancy debate, is notorious. The background of Matthew in relation to Judaism is unmistakably anti-Pharisaic. The vehemence of the attacks in ch. 23 is a factor which every account of Matthew's Gospel has had to consider. Unfortunately the uses of οἱ Φαρισαῖοι in Matthew cannot be said to reflect a single known social and religious situation, nor can the redactional work be simplified to a single moment in time. On the whole the association of scribes with Pharisees suggests opposition (as against 8:19, 13:52 and

[97] See pp.257-261.
[98] See pp.264-265.
[99] See pp.388-389.

23:34, where scribes are positively evaluated). But the Matthean terminology is not consistent,[100] and the association in only two contexts of Pharisees and Sadducees illustrates the inconsistency. The history of the Pharisees in the period after the Fall of Jerusalem is still shrouded in mystery and belongs with the picture of a divided Judaism. Smouldering revolution, the pragmatism of Yohanan ben Zakkai (was he a Pharisee?) and desolation over Jerusalem's Fall provide a few secure pieces for the puzzle. The division between Yohanan ben Zakkai and Eliezer could represent a distinction between a scribal tradition replacing Temple worship with Torah study and a Pharisaic attitude imitating Temple worship and committed to the restoring of the Temple, but that is a speculative picture. In some areas steps were taken to tighten the boundaries of acceptable Judaism but the variant forms of Judaism coexisted for decades. There is little evidence that Jews were involved in persecuting Christians, although there are stories which indicate worsening relationships during the period.

The picture of the Pharisees presented in Matthew is of a group of opponents (22:15; 23) whose actions do not match their teaching (23:3), who enjoy prestige and status, but who only succeed in making God's will less accessible (23:6-31), and who take their place in a sequence of those who kill the prophets (12:2,14). Tithing and purifying are out of focus in their teaching (9:11-13; they are legal rigorists), so that justice, mercy and faithfulness are neglected, despite their reputation for righteousness and responsibility. Casuistry replaces genuine care (15:2-7). There is some evidence in Josephus for this reputation of inconsistent behaviour; but there is evidence too that the Pharisees were unjustifiably tainted by rumour, and the reputation[101] which they had for mercifulness was not without justification.[102] Those details resemble, in general, features of the three parables in 21:28–22:14 The high priests and Pharisees heard the two initial parables as addressed to them (21:45) and made them a reason for apprehending Jesus. The third parable is followed by the Pharisees' declaration of intent to trap him (22:15).

So Matthean opposition to Pharisaism is evident. What is at issue in this disussion is the relation of this opposition to the sociological patterns described earlier. Should the opposition to the Pharisees be heard as a challenge to some of the Jewish leaders contemporary with Matthew? That seems likely, even if the picture given of the leaders is inaccurate. But with what purpose? Is Matthew attacking the opponents' views in order to

---

[100] See pp.26 n.32, 195-198.

[101] Sequences where agents are sent but are ill-treated or murdered are found in the parables of *The Tenants* and *The Feast*. The resemblances suggest that they are part of a common pattern.

[102] Mason, *Pharisees*.

discredit them as potential leaders and to enable the Jesus movement to turn the tables on them? Is the opposition an opposition within Judaism and is Matthew attempting to steer Judaism in a new direction? For that last theory to be correct, that Matthew stands within Judaism and is opposing Pharisees in order to challenge their leadership, 21:43 has to be understood in a very strained way. ἔθνει in 21:43 has to be understood as a reference to the leaders as a group, and it is difficult to find evidence for ἔθνος in that sense. Its natural sense is 'nation' or 'people'. As we saw earlier,[103] 21:43 appears to mean that a people which produces the fruit, which fulfils the divine will, is to receive the Kingdom of God. That does not mean that the tenancy of the vineyard passes from Israel, as if Israel were to be disinherited. But it does mean that those who fulfil the divine will, whether Jew or Gentile, are to inherit the fulfilment of God's promises and blessings. 21:43 is a clear indication that for Matthew Jews and Gentiles inherit the promises of God together and on the same grounds: they fulfil the Father's will. So, to judge by 21:43, Matthew's opposition to the Pharisees arises not from an inner struggle within Judaism but from a struggle to distance the Christian communities from a particular form of Judaism, one which is associated with the Pharisaic tradition.

To conclude the first sociological area of enquiry: the simple picture of a Jesus-movement within Judaism does not match the variety of Christian traditions found in the Matthean parables. The parables in Matthew illustrate different levels of Judaism and different relationships between Jewish and Gentile groups. These factors, together with a more satisfactory translation of 21:43, suggest that Matthew's church is not a group struggling to establish itself within Judaism, but one which is attempting to find its own identity and coherence within a society in which variant Jewish attitudes were strong.

The second sociological area for study concerns the structure and organization of the Matthean church. There is a tension within the Gospel of Matthew between passages which give authority to individuals or to groups (16:19; 18:18) and passages which indicate the same status for all (23:8: 'You are all brothers'). The latter passage deplores the use of titles, yet there are passages which use terms to designate particular roles from which certain benefits flow (prophet, righteous man, disciple 10:41-42) or particular agents of God who suffer on behalf of divine wisdom (prophets, wise men, scribes 23:34). There is also a tension between passages which give a special role to the disciples (13:10-12, where their position is more privileged than prophets and righteous men) and passages where the disciples have to give way to children, while it is the children that become heirs to

[103] See pp.388-389.

the Kingdom.[104] It is not clear that all the terms and titles in 10:41-42 and 23:34 reflect official roles or positions within the Matthean church. In all probability many of the roles reflect older patterns of community life. The position of the scribe has just been described; that is probably a profession greatly honoured in some quarters. The prophet also had a place in the Matthean church. Davies and Allison suggest that the existence of prophets can be inferred from the reference to false prophets in 7:15-23; true prophets should be thought of as itinerant, charismatic teachers, ascetics, wandering from place to place as the Son of Man did.[105] Homeless, wandering teachers would have treasured hard sayings such as 6:19-21 and they became the spiritual ancestors of the monastic movement (see Didache 10-11).

It is impossible to build up with any certainty a picture of the external organization of the Matthean church. So much of what is contained in the Gospel of Matthew could reflect earlier days; and some of the tensions mentioned in the previous paragraph could indicate variant styles of community life. However, the parable of *The Sheep* suggests some of the inner dynamics of the common life which the Gospel commends.[106] Like the four summary parables, it has at its centre an 'emblematic metaphor'. The metaphor of 'sheep' relates in Matthew 18 to the word field 'wander, stray',[107] to the Old Testament patterns of divine care (18:14), the mediation of that care through prophets and leaders, areas of pastoral care and responsibility (18:15-17) and the associations of 'defencelessness'. Surrounding the parable are two references to the 'little ones' (18:10,14), and the previous context includes the designation of a child as greatest in the Kingdom and drowning as a preferable fate to an offence against 'one such little one'. The metaphor of 'sheep' therefore engages with the context to such an extent that the content of 18:1-14 is summarized in the parable. The significance of these associations is that they give the 'little ones' (18:10) a place parallel to that which they have in 25:31-46. The 'little ones' are recognized as close to God's presence (see also 18:19-20). In their defencelessness and vulnerability it is Christ who is shown care. Moreover those who care are instruments of the divine will. They exercise mutual responsibility, sometimes corporately, sometimes individually, and in doing so they fulfil the purpose of God. The parables contain a number of these references to corporate and individual care. The fellow servants in 18:31 take up the case of their colleague in prison and their complaint is upheld. The reverse is true: the wicked servant ill-treats his fellow servants in 24:49 and the lord on his return avenges them. Central to the concept of ἐκκλησία in

104 Rowland, *Mysticism*.
105 Davies, *Matthew*, I 705.
106 See pp.273-280.
107 See p.274 n.332 (iii).

18:17 is a kind of mysticism of the weak, the child, the wanderer, the abused, which endows mutual care and compassion with an ultimate significance. It may be that this represents the Matthean ideal, albeit an ideal that permeates all the areas of human relationships.[108] It may be that, as Matthew saw it, all those who exercise responsibility or discipline are disadvantaged by the weak. Like the disciples whose status and privileges were set aside in favour of the child, the officials and leaders were invited to see their positions of honour and responsibility as secondary to the 'little ones'. The function of those in official positions is not disputed; but their place in the Kingdom is second to the weak and needy. It is perhaps in this sense that the leadership of the Pharisees has to be so heavily criticized. It is judged against the Matthean reversal of values. The term 'brother' expresses part of this theology of care (18:21; 23:8), and occurs often in Matthew; but it expresses only a part of Matthew's concerns. 'Brothers' are equal and in that sense the term lacks the inversion of values which Matthew 18 represents.[109]

No subject illustrates better the significance and permeating character of this Matthean ideal than finance. In a major city in the ancient world wealth created identity and social position. Possessions and property marked out an individual for honour and respect. To be asked to sell everything meant for the young man in 19:16-22 a total revolution of life,[110] involving the descent from honour to shame, from bright prospects to hardship, from security to vulnerability in a city where high mortality, disease, poor water and violence were a continual threat to the poor.

The interpretation of the parable of *The Sower* refers to 'deceptive wealth', which it places side by side with 'worldly worry' (13:22). The roots of this view of wealth go deep into the early Christian life. They are found in the earliest Jesus tradition, the peasant culture from which many early Christians came, as well as in the popular philosophical attitudes of the day.[111] With the transplantation of the Christian tradition into city life, what was said in that tradition about wealth, about its deceptive and destructive potential, remained valid. But in the city a great deal more needed to be said than that. The parables supplied this, providing images of good

---

[108] For a modern parallel to these ethical structures, see the Platonic presentation of the Good making possible everyday decisions in Murdoch, *Metaphysics*.

[109] See van Aarde, *God-with-us*, 276; Carter, *Households*, 114, regards chs. 19-20 as reversing the local household codes and takes childhood to be transitional, dependent and egalitarian. He uses Turner's categories of liminality but his concentration on chs. 19-20 neglects the role of ch. 18 and the use of μικροί there.

[110] Carter, *Households*, ch. 5; Barton, *Family*.

[111] Carter, *Households*, 127-131.

stewardship in economic affairs and hinting at the common sense of good trading practice (see Mt 13:44-46). Only hints are offered. The trades in the parables are all ancient trades, some of them the ones which enabled peasants to secure enough to live on in a primitive market economy. None of the new city trades finds a place. The contrast here with the rabbinic parables is interesting. Among the rabbinic parables 'glass makers' appear, and in a city like Antioch, with its classical glass-making tradition, new parabolic images are what one would expect. They are entirely absent from Matthew. In Matthew it is a matter of accepting the tradition and using it in such a way as to explore new areas of responsibility through the parables about vineyards and sowing, loans, pearls and servants. That could be understood either as a faithful reflection of an old peasant tradition, or as an indication that personal wealth and prosperous trading were not problems which most Christians faced. The latter may well be true. For many, riches, power, property and land rights operated as a threat to life, family and home.

The letter of James,[112] whatever its final date, gives a pre-Matthean view of wealth which may have influenced some of the communities in Antioch. On trading, James seems to suggest that the brevity of life (Ps 39:5,11) makes trading unimportant, but James qualifies this (Jas 4:15) by introducing the phrase ἐὰν ὁ κύριος θελήσῃ, as if to say that what is wrong about trading is its naive confidence in the future (Jas 4:16). Providing this perspective is modified, there is good to be done through local commerce, and it would be wrong not to do it (Jas 4:17). The next verses in James confirm that view: 5:2f is a lashing criticism of the rich. As in the Matthean tradition, the major criticism of the rich is that they import false standards into the life of the Christian community (Jas 1:9-11; 2:1-7,12). Their way of life encourages snobbery and extravagance (Jas 4:3). The criticism is of oppression, failure to pay servants and exploitation of labour, with the traditional insinuation that wealth is gained at the expense of others (Jas 5:4-6) through extortion, legal and illegal. The passage in Jas 4:13–5:11 is studded with prophetic and Wisdom phrases implying the inevitable judgment which will fall on this style of living.

The resemblance of James to some aspects of the Q tradition has often received comment.[113] There are the references in Jas 5:12 parallel to Mt 5:34-37: the use of τέλειον (Jas 1:4,17,25; 3:2), the teaching on prayer (Jas 1:5), the emphasis on ἔλεος (Jas 2:13) and μακροθυμέω (Jas 5.7ff), the parables of *The Tree* (Jas 3:11) and *The Fig Tree* (3:12) and *The Vine,* the parallel to Mt 5:9 in Jas 3:18, the problem of discipline and human anger (Jas 1:19-20; 4:1ff), judging one's neighbour and the need for humility (Jas

[112] See Davids, *James*, 63-84; Maynard-Reid, *Poverty*; Gonzalez, *Wealth*.
[113] See Hartin, *Q Sayings*.

4:6,12). That is not to say that Matthew and James belong within the same tradition, nor within the same period of time. The evidence suggests rather that the developments in James can be seen as prior to the Matthean and not entirely distinct from Matthean source material.

Placing Matthew's Gospel against that background and against the background of a city such as Antioch, the reader of Matthew can see the parables in a fresh light. The parable of *The Workers* deals in passing with the issue of exploitation of workers, the tricky problems of hiring in a changing economic environment, and the relative value of employment benefit and the opportunity to earn. It presents a context which encourages exploration of human attitudes and relationships in a concrete situation. It encourages the opening up of employer–employee contracts for critical discussion. The proper relationship of employer–employee matters, although, as we shall see, that relationship looks rather different when it is reviewed against the background of slavery in the ancient world.

If Matthew's Gospel belonged to an urban setting, the structure of the church's life would have been influenced by the surrounding social circumstances. The Matthean ideal and the consequences of that ideal for Christians living there would have been both shattering and creative. They were being asked to set up communities with a totally different base, with different expectations and different values. Living in them would have profound repercussions for daily life and work in the city, particularly for the rich and powerful. They may in some cases have suffered or had to choose marginalization because of their beliefs and behaviour patterns, and that could account for the inconspicuous character of Christians in cities like Antioch at the end of the first century CE.[114]

One further facet of the church's organization is the coexistence in it of Jew and Gentile. The interest of Matthew in Gentile mission is signalled in 28:18-20. It was in fulfilment of Scripture that Jesus himself, according to Matthew, taught and healed in a Gentile area (4:15ff; see also 8:1–9:34). Three pagan women and the wife of a pagan are included in the genealogy (1:3,5,6). 21:34 speaks of a people to whom the Kingdom will be given after the failure of the Jewish leaders, and the final vision divides all nations into those who serve Christ in their neighbour and those who do not. This evidence has led to a strong tradition of interpreting Matthew's ἐκκλησία as a mixed community composed of Jews and Gentiles.[115] The key point in the argument is that in Matthew the Gentiles are no longer to be welcomed

[114] The classic illustration of this inconspicuous character is the fact that Pliny, who worked in Antioch for many years, seemed surprised by information about Christians during his later stay in Bithynia.

[115] A recent statement of this tradition was given by Theissen in his Reid Lectures, Cambridge 1994.

into the Jewish fold; they are there in their own right on the same basis as Jewish Christians: in so far as they fulfil the will of the Father. A similar situation is found in the interpretation of *The Tares*.[116] Universal judgment is common in apocalyptic material; but in 13:36-43 the 'sons of the kingdom' are taken from the 'world' (13:38) and separated from those who cause σκάνδαλα and ἀνομία. In any other context there might be room for uncertainty about the significance of these terms. But in view of 8:11f and the Vision parable 25:31-46, there can be little doubt that according to 13:40-43 the angelic harvesters will separate out for the Father's Kingdom those of any nation who are righteous, and for punishment those who 'from his Kingdom' are causing offence and lawlessness (see 13:47-50).[117] 22:10 corresponds to the same picture: there are no limits to the second invitation; those invited include 'bad and good'; the unworthy will at the end be punished.

The diversity within the Matthean church indicates the level of the problem which the author of Matthew faced. Basic religious, social and cultural differences required a new approach to structure as far as the Christian communities were concerned, an approach which would provide a basis for common life and cooperation. Matthew found the basis in justice and mercy for the vulnerable and presented these ideals, not least in the parables, as relevant to every part of social and community life. The third sociological area of debate is the nature of the society contemporary with Matthew's Gospel. This has already been sketched out in some of its outlines. One institution which has not been considered in any detail is slavery.[118] The nine synoptic parables in which slaves appear include five Matthean examples: Mt 18:23-35; 20:1-16; 21:33-46; 24:45-51; 25:14-30, and these all deal with the master–slave relationship. The maintenance of slavery primarily for the benefit of the privileged raises again the inevitability of conflict between the Matthean ideals and the ancient pattern of privilege. Even where slaves carried heavy responsibilities (Mt 18:23-35; 25:14-30) and enjoyed a relatively high social esteem, they remained part of a system which implied relationships of dependence, with an associated range of attitudes and expectations. For many hearers the verb διχοτομήσει in 24:51 may have been received as storyteller's hyperbole,[119] but for some the punishment of a bad slave or the mockery of his plight would have been part of daily reality. The work of slaves in the Matthean parables could be read as attitudes of faithfulness and unfaithfulness, or as attitudes of obsequiousness and self-interest. The rewards offered to slaves in the

116 Wong, *Interkulturelle*, 155-177.
117 See pp.355-358.
118 For surveys of the relevant material, see Carter, *Households*.
119 Beavis, *Slavery*, 43, and the literature cited there.

parables are not freedom but further responsibility, and in Matthew the lazy are scoundrels to be disciplined rather than engaging rascals who are good for entertainment.[120] There is no clear suggestion, as there is no clear argument in contemporary comedy and fables, that there is anything fundamentally wrong with slavery. If therefore there were slaves in the Matthean communities, and on the evidence of New Testament material that is most likely,[121] the Matthean ideal would have encouraged a fresh set of different parabolic interpretations among them. Hearing the parables would have a special significance for the slaves. It would belong to what Gottwald calls the bond which links ourselves with the ancients as fragile social creatures but 'more graced with the possibilities of personal and social transformation than we often dare accept'.[122] We have already seen that the parables are open to alternative viewpoints, and when viewed from the aspect of economic exploitation they can look very different. Slaves would have heard Mt 20:1-15, 25:14-30, 21:33-46 as stories of individuals manipulating others for the purposes of wealth and power, and this could have influenced how they saw the nature of God when stories of the Kingdom depicted kings, merchants, landlords and financiers. They would have heard Mt 25:24-25 as a justified expression of fear and felt the accuracy of the description. We might describe it as the exploitation of surplus-labour value at the heart of ancient class conflict. For them it would have been more existential; they would have felt the unfairness and vulnerability of their own position. They would have heard Mt 20:15 as taunting the powerlessness of the slave, as laying the stinginess of the landowner on the shoulders of his employees, as shaming the labourers who had worked all day. They would have 'snorted—if not loudly guffawed—over the owner's nasty crack at the expense of the last batch of workers'[123] in Mt 20:6: 'Why are you standing around here idle all day?' Only the Matthean context could have given them hope and a belief in a different kind of God and a different set of judgments. The Matthean ideal set out in the previous chapter would have made for them the critical difference between a message which locked them in their daily subordination and one which set them free to explore new responsibilities under a loving Father. How far those explorations included new relationships within the Matthean communities is a matter of uncertainty. That the writer of the Gospel wished to see such explorations is very probable.

---

[120] Perhaps Luke is different. Luke may have a light-hearted comedy approach to the cunning rascal of a slave in Lk 16:1-9; see Heininger, *Metaphorik*.

[121] Meeks, *Urban Christians*, 63-64.

[122] Gottwald, *Social Class*, 22.

[123] Gottwald, *Social Class*, 20.

These three areas of sociological analysis have illustrated from the Matthean parables the significance of the sequence in chs. 18-21 as a focus of Matthean concern. The clashes of leadership, authority and class, reflected in the parables, are presented in that sequence as a challenge for those who ask 'Who is the greatest?'(18:1). They receive the uncompromising response that a little one is the true representative of the one whom we should follow.

The seventh and final area for study concerns the inner consistency in the Matthean material. Are we dealing with a text which has a single perspective sustained by a single community, or various perspectives drawn together as part of the Gospel writer's policy? The most substantial answer to this question given so far is that of Klein, who outlines several major differences which appear within the non-Marcan material in Matthew.[124] There are different attitudes to the fulfilment of the divine will: Jewish approaches which affirm traditional practices such as almsgiving, prayer and fasting, provided that these are performed modestly; transformations of apocalypticism which concentrate on accepting opportunities to serve others; Hellenistic Jewish patterns by which what is acceptable is defined, accepted by common consent and established by means of discipline. The attitudes to reward and punishment differ correspondingly. Traditional practices merit reward in heaven and their immodest performance no reward, since earthly approval has already been received; opportunities to serve others, if taken genuinely and open-heartedly, will be rewarded by eternal life, and failure will be punished by eternal punishment; infringements of accepted norms will be disciplined, if necessary by exclusion from the church. The relationships of these traditions to Judaism differ, the first being based on the Torah, deepened and radicalized, the second based on John the Baptist's call to immediate repentance, and the third showing clear signs of rejecting contemporary Judaism. These traditions represent different understandings of Christian spirituality and they have been brought together, so it is suggested, as part of a deliberate policy. The Gospel of Matthew represents the various trajectories of early Christianity to encourage the acceptance of them as part of a larger church.

Several important tensions have already been noted in the Gospel. There are the variations in style, in attitudes to mission, in attitudes to scribal authority; these need to be added to the differences in piety and spirituality. There is also the use of the Marcan tradition as a narrative Gospel, which is quite separate from the three traditions just described. This offers a spirituality which accepts the law, the promise of the Kingdom and rewards hereafter but stresses the carrying of the cross as preparation for the promise

[124] Klein, *Frömmigkeit.*

of Easter. The variety of these traditions is a remarkable feature of the Matthean Gospel as a whole.

The study of the parables offers two comments on that variety and on the policy suggested for their collection. First, the division of all the Matthean material into clearly defined traditions is difficult. *The Tares* and *The Feast* make the point well. *The Tares* is a result of the merging of traditions, and although the Marcan and the Baptist traditions can be distinguished in principle, in the parable of *The Tares* they can only be disentangled with great difficulty. The reason why they are so entangled would normally be explained on the basis of redactional activity; the final editor has joined them together. But there are no signs of a complete harmonizing of the traditions, otherwise the disentangling of the traditions would be completely impossible, nor indications that the traditions have been left to speak only in their own right, otherwise it would be tolerably clear where one tradition ended and another began. *The Feast* illustrates a further feature of this joining of traditions in Matthew. It is the result not only of the merging of traditions but the rendering of those traditions usable in different contexts. *The Feast* is a classic example of an extended epic. Originally expressing the 'replacement' motif, with its fearsome fate for those displaced, it contained a typical ambiguity: are those who share the feast people who are there because they have been invited, or because they have the necessary qualifications? To the original metaphor of 'the feast' has been added subsequent additional figurative material. These include the motifs of messengers and invitations, of violence, and of generosity.[125] Like so many extended epics it became, with the addition of these motifs, a reflective narrative capable of being used in different settings. The most interesting addition, pre-Matthean almost certainly, is the motif of the wedding garment. The language of the addition is reminiscent of apocalyptic, as is the reference to the wedding garment itself. But the reminiscences would only be picked up by those hearers who were acquainted with apocalyptic. The latter would read the episode as concerning a heavenly garment (as in 1 Enoch 62:15-16);[126] the person had lost the garment which is vital for the afterlife. Other hearers however, not so well acquainted with apocalyptic, whether Jew or Gentile, would have read the episode as about qualities of life and behaviour, or, in this case, about the absence of such qualities; for them the garment would be symbolic of good deeds. The apocalyptic imagery was retained in the parable but room was left for a transformation of its associations. There are several examples of this procedure in

[125] See pp.403-410.
[126] Sim, *Literary Dependence*, 18.

Matthew's Gospel: the imagery is retained but is left open for the reader to interpret.

This pattern of merging traditions and open imagery can be noted in many of the parabolic traditions, as Part Two indicates. It suggests a great deal about the character of end-redaction in Matthew. The traditions, particularly in the case of the parables, have been remembered and repeated many times. A sharing process, perhaps encouraged by the eventual author of the Gospel, has taken place, and the final act of writing the Gospel reflects that process. A great many influences are at work. The Deuteronomic themes[127] and the prophetic tradition concerning Jeremiah[128] have affected many parts of the Gospel, so that it is difficult to make clear-cut judgments about where traditions begin and end, and how they were joined together and transformed for wider circulation and use. To explore such an intricate textual pattern of merging traditions the theory of an author memorizing material, recalling, rehearsing and repeating it, has much to offer.

Second, the study of the parables has suggested that the policy behind the Gospel was that of commending all the traditions to every part of the church. The policy of seeking acceptance of the traditions by the whole church is open to misunderstanding. It could be understood as an authorial attempt to bring the communities into line, to impose an ecclesiastical theory of unity upon them, or even to enforce an ideology of belonging. The parables are evidence of a different motive. The way in which the parables have been grouped together, merged and extended, suggests an inner dynamic within the traditions. Sharing material was a natural expression of common interests and a consequence of the quality of the story sequence. The eventual author was an instrument of that process. The Gospel writer was instrumental in keeping the parabolic texts reflective and open. The texts reveal an authorial intention which encourages the audience to probe and explore, especially when that involves exploring the rich treasures which others have to offer. The Matthean ideal makes doubly unlikely a theory of ecclesiastical dictatorship, and may be an intended challenge to some of the representative forms of institutional leadership present in the local Christian communities. Seen from the standpoint of the parables, the variety of the traditions in Matthew, and the way in which they have been handled, suggest a policy of commending the traditions which encourages exploration, not capitulation.

So finally we arrive at the question of the Matthean genre. The Marcan Gospel is often understood to be in the ancient biographical genre. The arguments presented for this are: that the opening features specify the person

[127] See Charette, *Recompense*.
[128] See Knowles, *Jeremiah*.

of Jesus Christ as the subject of the Gospel; that the percentage of the Verbs which have Jesus as grammatical subject correspond to the usage in ancient biographies; that the external features, such as size, structure, scale, combination of sayings and speeches, and methods of characterization have a family resemblance to Graeco-Roman biography; and that the internal features such as settings, topics, atmosphere, quality of characterization and range of purpose roughly correspond to that genre. Mark is somewhat down the social scale from Graeco-Roman biography but such variations are to be expected.[129]

A similar case can be made for Matthew's Gospel. In addition to specifying Jesus Christ as the subject of the Gospel and a larger percentage of Verbs with Jesus as grammatical subject in the teaching material, Matthew has a genealogy for Jesus and Infancy Narratives which deal with his birth and the early months of his life The internal and external evidence corresponds to the range of material found in the biographies and falls within the likely boundaries of the genre. Since Matthew is dependent on Mark as a source and takes over the narrative outline of Mark, it could be regarded as probable that if Mark is biography Matthew will be biography too.

There is one qualification to this argument. A genre such as the ancient biography may develop, and three stages can be recognized as part of that development. The first is when the primary model is first assembled; the second is when that model is tidied up; and the third is when the model is given a radical reinterpretation and a new direction. The question is whether Matthew and Luke might be said to be in the second or third of those stages.[130]

The seven studies in the Matthean parables provide evidence by which to judge the validity of these conclusions. The studies cover features which have been quoted as generic to the ancient biography and indicate that Matthew probably belongs to the third stage of the development of the genre, if it has not already moved into a new genre. If it has moved into a new genre, it is not one which is known from other sources. Parts of it may be, but not the whole Gospel. The whole Gospel, if it has moved into a new genre, has a genre that is sui generis.

The first study illustrated how the traditional hypotheses were proving difficult to use against the background of refinements in vocabulary and stylistic research. Q and Mk, Matthew's two main sources, were not compiled or harmonized or edited in a way which encourages us, against that background, to establish for the editor a consistency of language and

[129] Burridge, *Gospels*, ch. 8.
[130] Burridge, *Gospels*, ch. 10.

method. Both between Q and Matthew and between Mark and Matthew a process of development has to be posited during which the sources were enlarged. This makes it difficult to be sure what contribution the final redactor made to the process and to what extent the redactor was making substantial changes to the tradition. In the process of development and in the final rounding off of the process there are signs that oral as well as literary activities were involved. That is particularly evident in the Matthean chapter of parables, where the form, positioning and the grouping of parables indicate a process rather than an editorial action. Space and time for the process have to be posited, so that there is opportunity for influences to pass to and fro between different parts of the tradition and for a measure of harmonizing to take place in the pre-Matthean stage as well as at the final stage of writing.

This Matthean evidence corrects one of the external features quoted as evidence for the biographical genre. The biographical genre is a literary genre dependent on authorial conception, choice, composition and style. What has become apparent is that, as far as choice of material was concerned, there were factors at work other than the author. The character of the tradition in so far as it was retained was not necessarily what the writer would have chosen. The development and the shaping of the traditions were influenced by other forces. Authorial work could achieve a unified character for the composition.[131] Oral tradition ensured that uniformity was not achieved.

The second study examined an example of Matthean composition, the fourfold use of summary parables to conclude discourses. This revealed Matthew's sensitivity to the function of parables. The functioning of the parables showed how discourse material with different facets could be given a parabolic focus. The complementary character of discourse and narrative became evident, with the parables ensuring that elements of instruction and law did not harden into authoritarianism. In the light of the four summary parables the discourses could be seen to suggest ways in which the narrative stories could be appropriated for discipleship and provide ideals and models by which the Gospel as a whole may be understood.

That does not correspond to the role ascribed to discourses in the theory of a biographical genre. As external features of biography they have been described as topical inserts into the narrative. It appears that they are neither topical nor inserts into the narrative. They have a shape and it has been claimed that the first of them resembles an ancient genre, the epitome.[132] More important is the function of the discourses as ensuring that the

[131] Burridge, *Gospels*, 202.
[132] Betz, *Sermon*, 15.

narratives are explored appropriately in the interests of responsible Christian discipleship.

The third study raised questions about the sub-text of a document such as Matthew's Gospel. It was argued that care has to be taken not to assume a sub-text on the basis of a single parable or a group of parables. Only the Gospel as a whole can confirm its implied world-view.[133] Parables have a historical context and are part of a historical revelatory tradition, but the historical context can change. There is one sub-text of the corpus of parables which deserves particular attention: it is the commitment of the audience to what they heard. The different traditions represented commitments from different groups. The gathering of the parables was a bringing together to a single focus of the commitment of various groups. This established the writer's contract. This was what gave the writer acceptability and intelligibility. What the writer wrote was heard on the basis of shared traditions.

The relevance of this to genre studies has already been proposed. Within genre studies it is assumed that choice of genre creates the contract between writer and audience.[134] When the author selects a genre, that gives shape to what is written and indicates how what is written is to be understood. From that point of view, it is argued, a genre cannot be sui generis; it would not offer criteria for its interpretation. In the case of Matthew, however, it appears that the contract is formed by the gathering of the material. Since that material represents different interests and different commitments, the contract is strong and binding on a wide audience. The perception of the audience may not be identical with that of the writer, but the initial contract makes possible a changing of attitudes and a widening of sympathies on the part of the audience.

Part of the strength of Matthew's policy is that it brought together picture language of unrivalled brilliance and creativity. The impact of the composition is stunning. Not only the parables but aphorisms and metaphors drawn from many traditions produce a striking tribute to the creativity of the one celebrated in the Gospel.

The fourth study supports a distinction introduced in biographical analysis: Luke, it is suggested, unlike Matthew does not attempt to provide teaching within a narrative setting.[135] In fact the relationship of the parables

---

[133] The analysis of the novels of Gordimer by Stephen Clingman, using Lévi-Strauss's analogy from geological faults, illustrates the issue: 'Contradictions and faults internal to Gordimer's work have also been vital, for they have frequently been the key to her historical consciousness, its range and limits and hence perceptible shape.' Clingman, *Gordimer*, 206.

[134] Burridge, *Gospels*, 105.

[135] Burridge, *Gospels*, 196.

to the other parts of the Gospel changes from one point of the narrative to another. In chs. 24-25 the parables indicate the practical ways in which those can respond who hear the story of the Passion and await the Son of Man's judgment. In chs. 18-23 the relationship of the parables to the narrative is partly illustrative; but at a deeper level what is happening is a reshaping of the events as the parables raise searching questions. The parables ask whether anything and anyone is secure; they turn this into a fundamental reason for receiving God's gracious gifts.

If that understanding of the function of the parables in chs. 18-23 is right, then another marginal difference between Matthew and the biographical genre opens up. In biography the main categories used in the examination of authorial intent and purpose are apologetic, polemic and didactic. These are the motivations which produce the finished article of a biography. What we have been describing in terms of Matthew's motivation concerns the balance of narrative and teaching. It also describes how learning and discovery take place when narrative fictions operate within a text. Instead of being part of a Gospel which is apologetic, polemic and didactic, the parables ensure that the Gospel is, above all, reflective.

The fifth study strengthens that impression. The modes of learning made possible in the Gospel, the undermining of ideology through the provision of a network of concepts such as mercy and justice and the subversive images of the child and the Victim Judge create new priorities within the Gospel. The stories and the narratives remain in place but those who hear them are supplied with new contexts for understanding them and working with them. A theological critique of narrative is in place.

The sixth study highlights one such critique, the role of the child seen in relation to Mt 18:1-14 and the parable of *The Sheep*. The social turmoil within which the audience of Matthew lived is one from which the Christian communities were by no means exempt. Leadership, status, wealth, experience of life, history of Jew and Gentile are headlines for a story of conflict and misunderstanding; they are also, potentially, in the light of Mt 18-23, headlines for a programme of change and readjustment.

The seventh study concerned diversity in spirituality as a background to Matthew's Gospel, and what kind of policy might have produced such a Gospel. Did the policy of the Gospel writer stand up to the critique which the Gospel provided? The parables provided a positive response to that question. By the way they are grouped together, merged and extended, they suggested that the writer had engaged in a learning process. Sharing material was a natural expression of common interest and a consequence of using stories and pictures of engaging and enthralling quality. If the writer was an instrument enabling that to take place, there was no dissonance between the ideals expressed in the text and the policy which brought the text into being.

Chapter One ended with an open question about a new genre model and with a stylistic comment drawn from the Appendix. The style of Matthew corroborates the argument of Chapter Three: the writer works with a model of conservation and collection. The style also indicates a process of homogenization and harmonization. It would be possible to present those two patterns as in conflict with each other. But that is not necessarily the case. The Matthean context brings them together as elements in a single process: listening, memorizing, rehearsing and harmonizing. They represent the writer's contract with the audience and the way in which the contract was fulfilled.

The answer to the open question has been to underline the ways in which the case for a biographical genre, which initially looks so strong, has several weak links. It could be that because Mark is a biography Matthew must also be within the same genre. But a Gospel which has redrawn the function and significance of narrative as effectively as the Gospel of Matthew, which emerged from a unique contract between writer and audience, which was based on lengthy preparatory work and provided in imagery, metaphors and parables a focus for distinctive expressions of Christian spirituality, has surely moved into a genre without parallel in the history of literature.

The irony is that once the Gospel of Matthew was removed from that unique context and from the special circumstances that brought it to birth, it would have been entirely natural for the Gospel to have been read as biography. Some might of course have seen in the predominance of teaching in Matthew's Gospel an opportunity to use it as a manual of instruction, and for them it would have moved into a philosophical genre. In either case the parable/discourse/narrative relationship which the original writer produced would have gone unnoticed. Something of the strength of the original Gospel would have been lost. The value of asking the question about a new genre model is that it sharpens our perception of the Gospel. It highlights aspects of Matthew's Gospel which can easily be overlooked, and we appreciate it once more as a unique piece of literary history.

PART TWO

CHAPTER FOUR

THE SUMMARY PARABLES

Part Two treats all the parabolic material in Matthew. In Chapter One we set out the principles by which data on vocabulary and syntax can be presented for identifying editorial activity in the Synoptic Gospels. In Chapter Two we defined the area of parabolic material for examination. We decided that this must include all imagery, aphorisms and narrative fictions and that all the parables will need to be treated under five headings: (i) their micro- and macro-contexts, including the figurative material in those contexts; (ii) their literary redaction, Gattung, Form and structure; (iii) their individual 'history of tradition', their synchronic and diachronic parallels; (iv) their distinctiveness in relation to the history of parables; (v) their distinctiveness in relation to Gospel redaction. Chapter Three illustrated the usefulness of considering the parables in four groupings: those which conclude discourses, those in the Chapter of Parables, those in Marcan contexts (especially in Mt 19-22), and those in the eschatological discourse.

As we saw in Chapter Three, all five major discourses conclude with a summary statement. Four of them conclude with a parable immediately before the summary statement. Apart from those four, few parables in the Synoptic Gospels conclude sections. So in this chapter the four summary parables will be discussed, as well as three others which might conclude sections.[1]

A. *The Two Houses* Mt 7:24-27/Lk 6:47-49

(i) *The Context*

A direct literary influence of the Matthean version upon the Lucan or of the Lucan upon the Matthean cannot be sustained without assuming a consistency of editorial procedure beyond that which linguistic usage can support.[2] A direct dependence of both on a reconstructable common written

---

[1] See pp.116-123.

[2] See Bergemann, *Prüfstand*, 202-229. Contrast Goulder, *Midrash*, 309, who classes 16 out of 95 words in this parable as characteristic of Matthew. The example of πέτρα illustrates the problems of his method (see Goulder, *Midrash*, 483). (i) His method neglects Lk 8:6,13 where Luke uses πέτρα and not

πετρώδης, as against Lk 6:48 (the only other certain use of πέτρα) where Luke agrees with Matthew in Mt 7:24, and Lk 23:53 where Luke lacks the word πέτρα Diff Mt and Diff Mk. (ii) His method conceals the different uses and contexts of πέτρα. For an attempt to remedy this, see Schenk, *Sprache*, 370. The uses are different: Mt 16:18 is Singular, meaning 'bedrock'; Mt 27:51 Diff Mk means either 'cliffs' or 'boulders'. Their contexts are also different: Mt 16:18 is connected in some way with the πέτρος/κῆφας problem. It could reflect an association with an Aramaic nickname (Fitzmyer, *Aramaic*, 121ff; Lampe, *Spiel*, 227-245; Caragounis, *Peter*, 108-113; for a response, see Davies, *Matthew*, II 625-626), or the πετρ-root could be common to both Greek and Aramaic (Chilton, *Peter*, 326 n.31; pace Wilcox, *Rock*), or, less likely because of its wider assumptions, the Greek cross-reference Peter/πέτρος could be paramount (Gundry, *Matthew*, 333f). Mt 27:51 is connected in some way with end-time expectations (Allison, *End of the Ages*, 41, quoting Test Levi 4:1, and Zech 14:4 LXX). (iii) His method has no means of evaluating the different construction: 7:24-25 uses οἰκοδομέω with ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν; 16:18 uses that same Verb with ἐπὶ τῇ πέτρᾳ. This outline is shortened, excluding the Par categories and including the Diff categories only:

ἐπὶ + Accusative				
Mt 61x:	3x Diff	ἐπὶ +	Genitive	(2x Diff Mk; 1x Diff Lk)
	1x Diff		Dative	(1x Diff Mk)
Mk 33x:	2x Diff		Dative	(2x Diff Mt; see τίθημι and προσκυλίζω.)
	1x Diff	ἐπὶ +	Dative	(1x Diff Mt)
Lk 90x:	1x Diff	εἰς +	Accusative	(1x Diff Mk)
	2x Diff	πρὸς +	Accusative	(1x Diff Mk; 1x Diff Mt)
	1x Diff		Dative	(1x Diff Mt)
	1x Diff	ἐπὶ +	Dative	(1x Diff Mk)
ἐπὶ + Genitive				
Mt 33x:	1x Diff	ἐπὶ +	Dative	(1x Diff Mk)
	1x Diff	εἰς +	Accusative	(1x Diff Mk)
	1x Diff	ἐν +	Dative	(1x Diff Mk)
	1x Diff	μετὰ +	Genitive	(1x Diff Mk)
Mk 21x:	4x Diff	ἐπὶ +	Accusative	(4x Diff Mt)
	1x Diff	ἐν +	Dative	(1x Diff Mt)
Lk 26x:	3x Diff	ἐπὶ +	Accusative	(1x Diff Mt; 2x Diff Mk)
ἐπὶ + Dative				
Mt 18x:	2x Diff	ἐπὶ +	Accusative	(2x Diff Mk)
	3x Diff		-	(2x Diff Mk; 1x Diff Lk)
Mk 15x:	1x Diff	ἐπὶ +	Genitive	(1x Diff Mt)
Lk 35x:	2x Diff	ἐπὶ +	Dative	(2x Diff Mk)

Since these variations occur in uses related to overlapping verbal associations, it is hard to resist the conclusion that Matthew's editorial usage is far from consistent. This is supported by the uses of:

οἰκοδομέω (see Schenk, *Sprache*, 370; Gundry, *Matthew*, 646; Bergemann, *Prüfstand*, 217):

Mt 10x: 1x No Par; 4x Par Mk; 3x Par Lk; 1x Diff Lk; 1x Text?
Mk 4x: 4x Par Mt
Lk 12x: 5x No Par; 3x Par Mt; 4x Diff Mt

source is not demonstrable once the difficulty of defining that written source is recognized.[3] On the other hand, both the introduction to the parable and

---

See also Lk 4:29 No Par with ἐπὶ + Genitive.

[3] A striking example is the opening of the parable. Several attempts have been made to define an exact Q text behind these two opening sentences:

Mt 7:24 πᾶς οὖν ὅστις ἀκούει μου τοὺς λόγους τούτους.

Lk 6:47 πᾶς ὁ ἐρχόμενος πρός με καὶ ἀκούων μου τῶν λόγων.

In the light of the following three detailed studies of vocabulary and syntax it would seem inadvisable to claim access to the text of a common source behind these two opening sentences:

(i) πᾶς οὖν ὅστις. Bergemann, *Prüfstand*, 204; Schenk, *Sprache*, 377f; Neirynck, *Vocabulary*, 295; Gaston, *Horae Synopticae*, 78. Schulz, *Q*, 312 n.378, treats the Matthean Relative Pronoun as original. He quotes Harnack, *The Sayings of Jesus*, 72, in support; but Harnack is arguing in terms of what is good Greek. Schulz's case is difficult to sustain in the light of the following:

(a) ὅστις

1. Mt uses ὅστις	Diff Participle	6x Diff Lk
		(Mt 5:39; 7:24-26; 10:33; Mt 23:12(2x))
Mk uses ὅστις	Diff Participle	1x Diff Mt (Diff Lk; Mk 12:18)
Lk uses ὅστις	Diff Participle	1x Diff Mt: Lk 15:7
		1x Diff Mt Text?
		(Mt 7:26 Θ 13.124.543.vg(1MS) Geo)
2. Mt uses ὅστις	Diff ὅς + Indic	3x Diff Mk
Mk uses ὅστις	Diff ὅς + Indic	1x Diff Mt
Lk uses ὅστις	Diff ὅς + Indic	1x Diff Mt
3. Mt uses ὅστις	Diff ὅς + Subj	3x Diff Lk; 1x Diff Mk
Mk uses ὅστις	Diff ὅς + Subj	1x Diff Mt
Lk uses ὅστις	Diff ὅς + Subj	None
4. Mt uses ὅς	Diff ὅστις	1x Diff Mk
Mk uses ὅς	Diff ὅστις	5x Diff Mt
Lk uses ὅς	Diff ὅστις	1x Diff Mk; 1x Diff Mt

(b) πᾶς ὅστις

Mt 7:24	Diff Lk	Participle
Mt 10:32	Diff Lk	πᾶς ὅς ἄν + Subj
Mt 19:29	Diff Mk	οὐδεὶς ὅς (Luke=Mark)

See also Acts 3:23; Deut 18:19 (LXX); Col 3:17.

(c) ὅστις οὖν Mt 7:24 Diff Lk; Mt 10:32 Diff Lk; Mt 18:4 Diff Mk. Mt 18:4 could be a pre-Matthean summary use.

(ii) ἀκούει μου τοὺς λόγους / μου τῶν λόγων

Schulz, *Q*, 312, takes the Genitive to be a Lucan classicism (see Jülicher, *Gleichnisreden*, II 260). Wrege, correctly in view of the evidence below, doubts this: *Überlieferung*, 154 n.3; see also Bergemann, *Prüfstand*, 211.

ἀκούω + Genitive

Mt 3x of PERSON: 1x No Par; 1x Par Mk; 1x Diff Lk (Text ?)

Mk 8x of PERSON: 1x Par Mt

	2x Diff Mt
	1x Mk 6:11 ὑμῶν: Mt 10:14 λόγους ὑμῶν
	1x Mk 12:28: ὅτι Mt 22:34
	1x >*Mt
	4x >
Mk 1x of THING:	1x Diff Mt
	Mk 14:64 βλασφημίας; Mt 26:65 βλασφημίαν
Lk 12x of PERSON:	6x No Par; 1x Par Mk; 3x Diff Mk
	2x Diff Mt (Mt 10:40 δέχομαι)
Lk 2x of THING:	1x Diff Mt (Lk 6:47/Mt 7:24)
	1x No Par (Lk 15:25)

ἀκούω + Accusative

Mt 22x	4x No Par; 4x Par Mk; 7x Diff Mk; 3x Par Lk;
	4x Diff Lk
Mk 7x	4x Par Mt; 3x >
Lk 23x	10x No Par; 2x Par Mk; 5x Diff Mk; 3x Par Mt;
	3x Diff Mt.

See especially Lk 8:21: Mk and Mt have ποιέω (Mk 3:35; Mt 12:50).
There are 2x + Accusative = 'about' Mt 24:6/Mk 13:7?/Lk 21:9;
Mt 14:1 Diff Mk.
There is 1x + Accusative = 'to get to know' Mt 12:42/Lk 11:31. Schenk, 383f.
The inadvisability of calling the Lucan use a 'classicism' is further underlined by noting that Josephus is capable of using either Accusative or Genitive in identical constructions:

ἀκούω + Accusative	W 1,77; 1,257; 1,300; 1,321; 1,548; 2,113; 2,209.
ἀκούω + Genitive	W 1,83; 3,495; 1,199; 1,244; 1,529.

Similarly, Acts is fairly evenly divided between the two: (26/22).
If anything, the evidence would favour an original source reading of λόγων, but it is best to remain agnostic on the question: see Bergemann, *Prüfstand*, 211.
(iii) ὁ ἐρχόμενος πρός με.
Jülicher, *Gleichnisreden*, II 260-261, suggests that this phrase may have stood in Q and may have been retained by Luke despite its poor fit with Lk 6:46, since ἔρχομαι πρός με appears not only at Lk 14:26 and 18:16, but in Mt 19:14 also, and could have been omitted by Matthew in Mt 7:24 as inconsistent with τούτους. Some commentators regard the phrase as Lucan redaction (Schulz, *Q*, 312). Marshall, *Luke*, 275, disagrees, quoting Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium*, I 383 n.19, as support for a possible Aramaic construction reflected in a Nominativus Pendens. As an argument for the phrase being early that case is probably unreliable (the hanging Nominative may have resulted from the use of the editorial ὅμοιος τίνι Lk 6:47; see Lk 7:31 Diff Mt). However, Jülicher's case does deserve attention, except that the usage of ἔρχομαι πρός is rather more complicated than he suggests (see Mt 26:40 Diff Mk 14:37 but Par Lk 22:45; also there are Mk 3x Diff Mt and Lk 7:7 >*Mt). These additional difficulties make a final judgment almost impossible (see Wrege, *Überlieferung*, 154, and Bergemann, *Prüfstand*, for further arguments). The presence of the phrase in the source, if it were to be considered likely on the grounds of synoptic use, would be explained as traditional narrative terminology (see Lk 6:17; Jn 6:45) or possibly as Wisdom language (Prov 9:5 LXX). In the light of the three studies, (i), (ii) and

its sequel in Mt 7:28/Lk 7:1 suggest that there was a common source behind the two versions, although neither immediately behind them, nor common to both in every detail.[4] The reconstruction of such a common source is bound therefore to be hypothetical, all the more so because the variations between the two versions include elements which could be ascribed to traditional and oral factors.[5]

(iii), it would be inadvisable to claim immediate access to a text of the original source at the opening of this parable.

[4] Both the ending and the beginning of the parable give evidence of a common source, but uncertain indications as to how the source read. Mt 7:28 and Lk 7:1 suggest a common conclusion to this collection of sayings. The Matthean form cannot however be derived from the Lucan nor the Lucan from the Matthean (see p.10 n.7). As far as the beginning is concerned, the double use of ὁμοιωθήσεται (Mt)/ὅμοιος (Lk) in Mt 7:24,26, Lk 6:47,49 is without parallel in the Synoptic Gospels. A common source is likely on that ground alone. Schulz reconstructs its form (*Q*, 312, and n.383): ὅμοιος is original with a question attached: 'ὁμοιοῦν begegnet im Passiv bei den Synoptikern nur noch 7mal bei Mt; mit ὅμοιός ἐστιν eingeleitet Vergleichssätze in Q auch Lk 7,32 par; Lk 13,19 par; Lk 13:21 par.' Schulz's arguments are interesting but not compelling: (i) Why on Schulz's assumptions does Matthew fail to follow Q here and at Mt 13:31,33, but follows Q at Mt 11:16=Lk 7:31 (both have τίνι...ὁμοιώσω)? Schulz's evidence for τίνι...ὁμοιώσω as a form preferred by Q is only reliable if Mt 13:31,33 can be shown to be editorial (as Schenk assumes: *Sprache*, 372). We shall offer evidence that 13:31,33 may not be editorial. In Lk 6:47 the possibility of a Graecized expression is worth considering (Wrege, *Überlieferung*, 154; Jeremias, *Parables*, 101 n.53; Dositheus 4:7). (ii) The passive uses of ὁμοιόω in Matthew (Schenk, *Sprache*, 372) can be divided into the Aorist and the Future uses. The Aorists 13:24, 18:23, 22:2 do not fit into a neat, separate category with an obvious editorial reason for the Aorist. The Future uses probably do, although the Future in Mt 11:16=Lk 7:31 is to arouse interest (Harnack, *Sayings*, 53; Klostermann, *Matthäus*, 71) rather than to provide a future reference. (iii) The interrogative τίνι...ὁμοιώσω in Lk 6:47 is dependent on ὑποδείξω, a construction paralleled in Lk 12:5 Diff Mt >*. Jeremias, *Sprache*, 149, Schulz, *Q*, 312 n.381, classify this as redactional. Much depends on what weight is given within judgments about redaction to variations of meaning. Do Lk 6:47 and Lk 12:5 represent the only weak uses of the Verb = 'tell', as distinct from the other Lucan uses: 'reveal', 'warn', 'illustrate'? Tobit uses weak and strong together (7:10; 10:8/9), so the argument must not be overplayed (see Bergemann, *Prüfstand*, 223). The interrogative τίνι...ὁμοιώσω attached to ὑποδείξω may allow a glimpse of the original source, as Schulz suggests. There are certainly signs that parabolic introductions use interrogative forms (Lk 13:18,20; Mk 4:30), and there are indications of parallels to this within the contemporary communication process (see p.84). But the initial problem remains: why both Matthew and Luke follow Q in using the interrogative form at Mt 11:16=Lk 7:31, whereas in other cases they do not.

[5] This can be illustrated from the Matthean and Lucan versions of the storm. In neither case is there clear evidence of redactional work; in both there are

traditional elements. In Matthew the storm is given in both halves of the parable with four phrases:

(i) κατέβη ἡ βροχὴ The context recalls the Verb's meaning in OT contexts with ὑετός, ὕδατα, δρόσος. This distinguishes the usage from the two possible Matthean redactional uses of καταβαίνω:

καταβαίνω Schenk, *Sprache*, 318; Gundry, *Matthew*, 645.

Mt 11x: 1x No Par; 5x Par Mk; 2x Diff Mk; 1x Par Lk; 2x Diff Lk

Mk 6x: 5x Par Mt; 1x >

Lk 13x: 9x No Par; 2x Par Mk; 1x Diff Mk; 1x Par Mt

βροχὴ is a less usual piece of vocabulary; see LXX Ps 67(68):9; Ps 104(105):32. It may owe its place here to alliteration with κατέβη, parallel to ἔπνευσαν οἱ ἄνεμοι, and to its unambiguous sense, over against ὄμβρος (see Gen 7:12 Aquila). At no point in the Matthean storm is the characteristic vocabulary of the Old Testament Flood Narrative found. Schenk's argument for a redactional strengthening via this phrase is dealt with in our discussion of the progressive increments in imagery during the tradition history of the Sermon on the Mount, on p.129 and p.180 n.12.

(ii) ἦλθον οἱ ποταμοί As against the Lucan Singular the Matthean Plural ποταμοὶ has the nuances of the English word 'floods'. In the LXX it means 'floods', 'rivers', associated with the waters of chaos (Ps 23(24):2; 92(93):3; 97(98):8; Jonah 2:3), with beneficent creation (Ps 106(107):33; Isa 50:2), or with judgment (Cant 8:7; Wis 5:22; Hab 3:8-13, with a reference in some versions to θεμέλιον). The Simple Verb third-person Plural ἦλθον is unusual in Matthew (22:3).

(iii) ἔπνευσαν οἱ ἄνεμοι. The statistics for ἄνεμοι (Plural) are:

Mt 1x Par Mk; 2x Diff Mk (Singular); 2x Diff Lk

Lk 1x Diff Mk (Lk 8:25). See Schenk, *Sprache*, 28-29, who records without comment or explanation that Matthew uses the Singular in the Sea Epiphany 14:24,30,32, retaining the Singular from Mk 6:48,51 and adding it in 14:30. The Plural appears in the LXX in contexts of God's sovereign power (Ps 103(104):3; 134(135):7) or of Wisdom's superiority (Prov 9:12; 24:27(30:4)), but rarely with ἔπνευσαν (Sir 43:16-20; of particular interest is the alliterative use in 43:20). There are parallels in rabbinic literature (Schlatter, *Matthäus*, 263), in secular literature (Josephus War 2,190; Ant 1.118, and *Cor Fab Aesop Synt* 55). The placing of the Verb in first position may suggest a sequential picture.

(iv) προσέπεσαν + Dative 7:25; προσέκοψαν + Dative 7:27. The variant readings in 7:25 include: προσερρηξαν ΣΘ (see Luke 6:48), προσεκρουσαν, προσκοψαν (see Mt 7:27), irruerunt, impegerunt, offenderunt, inciderunt, venerunt, percusserunt, corripuerunt. See Wilson, *Primitive Error*, 138, and Nestle, *Matt.VII*. The variant readings in 7:25 may reflect the unusual character of a Verb which is rarely associated elsewhere with the natural elements (see Josephus Ant 9,225: of the rays of the sun). The Plural could refer to both wind and water, although Jülicher takes the variants in vv25 and 27 to be appropriate to particular elements (*Gleichnisreden*, II 262). The Dative in v25 could be due to attraction of construction: in the LXX προσπίπτω is always accompanied by the Accusative (24x); secular parallels however use the Dative (see Xenophon, *Equites* 7:6 of various kinds of collision; there are examples also in Aesop and Aristophanes). Perhaps the avoidance of προσπίπτω in 7:27 could be to prevent

In both Matthew and Luke the parable of *The Two Houses* concludes the same sequence of sayings: Mt 7:18/Lk 6:43 *Trees and their Fruits*; Mt 7:21/Lk 6:46 *Lord, Lord*; 7:24/6:47 *The Two Houses*. In both Gospels this sequence of sayings ends a larger collection of material held in common.[6] Once literary dependence of one Gospel upon the other is rejected, this evidence of material held in common, often in the same order, requires the hypothesis of a continuous source behind Matthew and Luke. In this source the parable of *The Two Houses* occupied the position of a climactic conclusion.[7]

The Matthean context contains references to judgment and to wisdom. Matthew 7:22, coming immediately before the parable, refers to the Day of Judgment when false prophets will find themselves rejected; this becomes a framework in which the parable can be heard.[8] There are correspondences to

---

an anticipation of the climax by keeping the idea of 'fall' to the very end. But both Verbs bring the storm to its climax with metaphors of attack and assault. In the ancient world the sequential description, with its vocabulary, order and style, could hardly fail to evoke the widespread tradition of the destructive mountain river (see Petrounias, *Aischylos*, 34ff). That is not to say that the coloration of the words at no point hints at divine judgment; but those are extended elements in a traditional evocation of destruction by storm, flood and wind.

Luke's description is very different. However, its beginning is not a Lucan construction any more than Matthew's is Matthean. It begins with a Genitive Absolute of a syntactical form often adjusted by Luke (see Appendix No. 109) but found also in Marcan and Matthean temporal descriptions. The noun πλημμύρης appears in Job 40:18(23) describing a rising river, running with a swift current (for a confirmation that the passage was understood in this way in the first century CE see 11QJobtg 40:18); Aquila uses the Noun metaphorically to describe the flood of caravans converging on Jerusalem in Isa 60:6 and the wealth of the sea providing sustenance for Zebulun in Deut 33:19; it describes the inundation of the Nile in POxy 1409.17, and can be applied to flood or flood-tide in more general usage; in Jos Ant 2,250 it appears as a textual variant for πλημθῶρα, of rivers in spate. The Verb προσέρρηξεν is Intransitive: 'broke against', whereas in Jos Ant 9.4,6; Jer. 28(51):20; 31(48):12, it is Transitive. Some of the other features of the storm in Luke show slight signs of Lucan construction (Jeremias, *Sprache*, 150f).

[6] See Davies, *Matthew*, I 115-127.

[7] If οὖν is read it strengthens the case for this parable as a summary: see Mt 18:23. If the μου is emphatic, this gives the parable the function of a recapitulation (Davies, *Sermon*, 94). The division of the parable into two parts underlines the theme of *The Two Ways*. Davies regards the parable as part of an eschatological triad, balancing the opening of the Sermon and parallel to the triad of parables in ch. 25 (Davies, *Matthew*, I 693-730). But the triadic pattern is already present in the pre-Matthean tradition, and the parallelism suggested between 7:15ff and chs. 24-25 is so broad that the distinctive features of the parables which conclude the discourses are lost.

[8] Betz, *Essays*; Böcher, *Wölfe*; Hill, *Prophecy*; Krämer, *Propheten*; Minear, *False Prophecy*.

the Day of Judgment within the parable itself, in the description of the storm[9] and the disastrous collapse of the second house.[10] There are Wisdom elements in the immediate context of the parable, e.g. Mt 7:23 οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν; there are also Wisdom elements in the parable itself: 7:27 βροχή, πτῶσις, and the φρόνιμος/μωρός[11] contrast, providing a Wisdom context for the obedience/disobedience contrast. Matthew inherited the association of wisdom and judgment from various kinds of aphoristic material, from the Q and the Marcan sources. So the Matthean context of the parable of *The Two Houses* is an inherited association of judgment and wisdom.

The structure of the Matthean Sermon on the Mount will be examined later. For the present purpose it is sufficient to see the parable of *The Two Houses* as the climax of its material. The cohesion of this material is greatly assisted by its rich imagery. This wealth of imagery is best understood as the product of a process of growth. Attempts to see it as the work of a single mind are based on inaccurate readings and should be rejected.[12]

---

[9] See n.5 above.

[10] For πτῶσις, see Sirach (12x). On ῥῆγμα, see Arndt and Gingrich for its use in the contexts of buildings and dams. For non-Lucan features here, see Wrege, *Überlieferung*; on the proverbial expressions appropriate to this vocabulary, see Jeremias, *Parables*, 194 n.8: especially Philo, *Migr Abr*, 13:80, μέγα πτῶμα πίπτειν 'to come a cropper'.

[11] (i) φρόνιμος. Schenk, 143; Gundry, 649; Davies, *Matthew*, I 76; Bergemann, 223.

Mt 7x:	5x No Par	1x	φρόνιμοι ὡς οἱ ὄφεις
		4x	The Parable of *The Ten Young Women*
	1x Diff Lk		The Parable of *The Two Houses*
	1x Par Lk		The Parable of *The Two Servants*
Lk 2x:	1x Par Mt		
	1x No Par		The Parable of *The Clever Steward*

See also the use of the Adverb φρονίμως (Lk 16:8). In the LXX φρόνιμος has a different word field from the English Adjective 'wise': see Prov 17:27 μακροθυμία, reverence for officials by the community (Sir 19:31; 21:17), patience (Prov 18:14), humility and ability to handle anger (see von Rad, *Wisdom*, 113ff). In the fables φρόνιμος is a significant focus, often found in proverbial conclusions (*Cor Fab Aesop* 9.II,17; III,15).

(ii) μωρός Schenk, 143; Gundry, 646; Bergemann, 226; Garland, *Matthew 23*.

Mt 7x: 5x No Par (5:22; 23:17; 3x *The Ten Young Women*); 1x Diff Lk; 1x Text?) In 23:17 μωρός is someone unable to perceive the revelation of God. In the LXX, 28 uses out of 37 are in Sirach; see Sir 20:17–21:23, where the insecurity of the foolish is highlighted and μωρός is parallel to ὕβρις and ὑπερήφανος.

[12] An illustration is Goulder's discussion of 'parts of the body' in *Midrash*, 103ff. His reference to the development of imagery concerning 'parts of the body' depends on a mistranslation of πνεύματι by the word 'heart'. The 'puzzle'

There are pre-Q groupings of logia such as Mt 6:25-33/Lk 12:22-31,[13] which bring imagery about divine providence (πετεινά, κρίνα) into association with 'hearing and doing God's will', and Mt 7:16-20, where aphorisms, building on a basis of experiential wisdom, stress the correspondence between present decisions and future judgment.[14] Larger units can also be identified, parallel to Sirach 28-31 in content, and like Sirach rich in imagery.[15] Part of that imagery concerns judgment: 'There are winds created to be agents of retribution, with great whips to give play to their fury; on the day of reckoning they exert their force and so allay the anger of their Maker.'[16] Doing God's will and enjoying his providence, or disobeying and reaping the whirlwind, are the alternatives for humanity within God's world.

All these stages involve the bringing together of imagery from other varied contexts. There is the material shared with Luke's Sermon on the Plain (Lk 6:31,37-38,41-42 with images of κάρφος and δοκός,[17] and Lk 6:46); there is the material shared with further contexts in Luke: Lk 12:22-31,33-34; Lk 11:9-13,34-36 using κρούω, ἰχθύς, ὄφις,[18] and Lk 13:23-24,26-27 using θύρα/πύλη.[19] In Matthew this latter material is framed as *The Two Ways* (7:13-14): those who are obedient find life; those who are not find destruction. Those on their way to destruction are a threat to the righteous (the picture of λύκοι in 7:15).[20]

Pairs of images[21] are a notable feature of the whole Matthean Sermon and exercise a symbolic force. They underline the distinction between obedient and disobedient. Such pairs of images and pairs of Verbs are by no means unique to Matthew. They are characteristic of the material common to Matthew and Luke and they are found at all levels of the material of the

---

involved in the 'eye' references, interrupting the thought of 6:19-21 and 6:24, is a puzzle of his own making. The increased imagery is due to the gradual association of units. Since he concentrates on 5:27-30 he leaves unexplained the different form of Mt 18:8-9 Diff Mk 9:42ff. His reference to antitheses does not mention that the one cheek, the other cheek, shirt and cloak (5:39-40) are Lucan as well as Matthean (as well as overstating the antithesis of 'left' cheek and 'right' cheek).

[13] See Oltshoorn, *Background*, who notes the chiastic form of this group of sayings in their Q form.

[14] Piper, *Wisdom*.

[15] Pesch, *Exegese*; Zeller, *Mahnsprüche*; Cathcart, *Parables*.

[16] Sirach 39:28.

[17] bArak 16b. See Gereboff, *Tarfon*, 247; Jónsson, *Humour and Irony*, 105.

[18] Schulz, *Q*, 370.

[19] Wrege, *Überlieferung*, 132-135.

[20] Bornkamm, *TDNT*, 4.308-311; see also Derrett, *Studies*, I 176-187, and Luz, *Matthew*, I 433-438.

[21] See Mt 5:13-14.

Sermon on the Mount. Their presence in such numbers makes their symbolic character more obvious, and foreshadows the contrast in *The Two Houses*. So the final parable, 7:24-27, with its own powerful imagery brings into focus the contrasts which are present throughout the Sermon; it summarizes the contrast between obedience and disobedience present from the early stages of the material; it reinforces the Matthean contrast between *The Two Ways*, with its word of judgment on the false prophets.

Interspersed in the material are proverbial sayings and aphorisms with parallels from extra-biblical sources. If, as is likely, Gentiles were among the early audience of Matthew's Gospel, then passages such as Mt 6:24,[22] 7:2,[23] 7:13,16[24] and 7:20[25] would have suggested for them a link between Matthew's wisdom and extra-biblical wisdom.[26] How far an extra-biblical factor can be detected in the wording and function of 7:24-27 will be discussed later.[27]

In summary, the section of the Sermon on the Mount which leads up to the parable of *The Two Houses* demonstrates the contribution of imagery to the development of the Sermon. A rich assembly of pictures was produced at the pre-Matthean stage through the interlacing of source material. Particularly important is the support given by proverbs, Wisdom sayings and picture sayings[28] to the theme of 'obedience on the basis of providence' and judgment on disobedience,[29] providing a mixture of biblical and extra-biblical wisdom.

(ii) *The Redaction*

The inner structure of the parable in Matthew exhibits a greater degree of balance between its two sections than is the case in Luke.[30] The balance

---

[22] Plutarch, *Moralia*, 180B.

[23] Lucretius, *De Rerum Natura*, 4.330.

[24] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives*, 4.19.

[25] Horace, *Odes*, 4.4.31-32.

[26] Harvey, *Commands*, ch. 7, considers the intensification of proverbs through paradox and hyperbole, jolting the hearer into new judgments about existence. It may however be that proverbial material in the Sermon on the Mount has an additional function. This function belongs to the later history of the tradition: to raise from the 'wisdom of this world' the same issues concerning the 'divine rule' as were raised by Jesus in relation to the wisdom of Israel.

[27] See below, pp.184-188.

[28] Betz, *Sermon*, ch. 6.

[29] Betz, *Sermon*, 122.

[30] The antithetic character of the parable can be set out as follows:

1. ἀνδρὶ φρονίμῳ
   a. ὅστις ᾠκοδόμησεν αὐτοῦ τὴν οἰκίαν ἐπι τὴν πέτραν.
   b. καὶ κατέβη ἡ βροχὴ
      καὶ ἦλθον οἱ ποταμοὶ

between its two sections within the structure of a single parable and the slight variations within the antithetic parallelism are distinctive of Matthew within the synoptic tradition.[31] It would seem likely that the fully antithetic form represents a later stage in the development of this parable, not, as

---

καὶ ἔπνευσαν οἱ ἄνεμοι
καὶ προσέπεσαν τῇ οἰκίᾳ,

c. (i) καὶ οὐκ ἔπεσεν
(ii) τεθεμελίωτο γὰρ ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν.

2. ἀνδρὶ μωρῷ
a. ὅστις ᾠκοδόμησεν αὐτοῦ τὴν οἰκίαν ἐπι τὴν ἄμμον.
b. καὶ κατέβη ἡ βροχὴ
καὶ ἦλθον οἱ ποταμοὶ
καὶ ἔπνευσαν οἱ ἄνεμοι
καὶ προσέκοψαν τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἐκείνῃ,
c. (i) καὶ ἔπεσεν
(ii) καὶ ἦν ἡ πτῶσις αὐτῆς μεγάλη.

The balance of the inner sections is complete except for the use of προσέκοψαν in 2b4, the addition to 2b4 of ἐκείνῃ and the alternative ending to 2, καὶ ἦν ἡ πτῶσις αὐτῆς μεγάλη instead of τεθεμελίωτο γὰρ ἐπὶ τὴν ἄμμον. (See Lk 6:49.) The balance in Luke's version is incomplete and seems to show an intentional abbreviation in its second half.

[31] Jeremias, *Parables*, 90 n.6, makes a distinction between the double parables (such as *The Mustard Seed* and *The Leaven*), and single parables arranged in antithetic parallelism. Under the latter category he classifies: (i) *The Two Houses*. (ii) *The Broad and the Narrow Gate*. In Matthew the form is strictly antithetical, with exact parallelism. In Luke 13:23-24 the antithesis is to be found in only two words and the parallelism is absent. (iii) *The Good and the Bad Tree* (Mt 7:16-18; Lk 6:43f). Both Matthew and Luke have antithetical parallelism (so it is to be assumed for Q), and Matthew has this twice, with an introduction and summary. The parallelism in each case is brief. (iv) *The Good and the Evil Treasure* (Mt 12:35; Lk 6:45). Both Matthew and Luke have antithetic parallelism (so that is to be assumed for Q), with Luke offering a second half which is abbreviated. Two words are omitted in the second half of the Lucan form which appear in the first half and are to be assumed for the second. In both Matthew and Luke the parallelism is followed by a clause introduced by γὰρ. (v) *Faithfulness and Unfaithfulness* (Mt 24:45-51; Lk 12:42-46). Matthew and Luke are nearly identical in wording. Matthew adds κακός in antithesis to πιστός. The antithesis is clear in both, but the parallelism between the two parts is far from exact in length, content and sentence structure. It is necessary to add to Jeremias's list *The Unforgiving Servant* and *The Sheep and the Goats*. These extended narratives have internally balanced structures, with clearly defined antithetic parallelism.

It is possible to argue from this that antithetic parallelism is part of the Q tradition, although distinctive for the Matthean rather than the Lucan tradition, and never vice versa. Exact antithetic parallelism is however very rare outside Matthew even in brief parables. It is safest to conclude that the Matthean tradition makes distinctive use of antithetical parallelism as an inner structural device. It is better to regard this as a feature of the Matthean tradition than to label it redactional.

Flusser argues, an original stage,[32] since otherwise signs of a fully antithetic parallelism within the structure of extended parables would have appeared outside the Matthean material.

A mark of this structural feature is repetition with slight variations.[33] In Matthew's version the repetition between the two sections of the parable is often extensive and exact. Slight variations such as Mt 7:27 προσέκοψαν and Mt 7:25 προσέπεσαν add interest to the narrative, as does the use of alliteration, a technique which can be traced to the pre-Matthean source.[34] Recurrent phrase lengths can be measured by counting syllables.[35] Although judgments on this, as so often in the case of Matthean narratives, vary with textual assumptions, the rhythmical characteristics of phrase length and metrical interest are too frequent to be dismissed altogether; they intensify the poetic impression of the repetitive structure.[36]

The narration is superficially simple and subtly profound. It reads and performs like a fable, and like the literary fable contains cross-currents of interest. Three bands of interest can be identified. There is the emblematic metaphor πέτρα with its associated fields of reference and vocabulary;[37] there is the system of Wisdom terms; and there is the storm description which integrates with these and includes the traditional motif of the 'raging river'. Close parallels to the Matthean 'storm' are Sirach 39:28 and Ezekiel 13:11-14. In Ezekiel, as in Matthew, the storm description has a triple form, twice repeated. That particular parallel, although it belongs to a different Gattung from the parable, is a prophetic oracle of judgment, with an initial messenger formula; it overlaps with the Matthean reference to a 'fall' resulting from the storm.

---

[32] Flusser, *Gleichnisse*, 103-104.

[33] See p.423 and p.182 n.30.

[34] See Michaelis, *Aufbau*.

[35] This gives the following for the Matthean Parable of *The Two Houses*:

		a.	b.	c(i)	c(ii)
1. (vv24-25)	5:	7:6:5	7:7:8:5:4	5	7:5
2. (vv26-27)	4:	7:6:5	7:7:8:5:7	4	7:3

[36] There are also internal rhymes and assonances, in addition to those already mentioned: e.g. in 2. the 6:5 conclusion rhymes: οἰκίαν/πέτραν, οἰκίαν/ἄμμον.

[37] As is indicated in the LXX designations for God, 'rock' is one of an interlocking system of metaphors (Olofsson, *Rock*). The mythology associated with 'rock', the Temple rock and its security against chaos, illustrate part of that system (Braun, *Qumran*). Like the Psalmist the one whose behaviour is righteous finds a refuge in God against all the torrents which threaten destruction (compare 1QS 11:4; Pss 18 and 85; Ps Sol 15: Wernberg-Møller, *Manual*, 151; Leaney, *Qumran*, 252); the torrents which threaten destruction resemble the powers of chaos: Betz, *Felsenmann*, 64 (Betz gives the context of Yalqut I 766 Num 23:9, pace Goulder, *Midrash*, 309).

The parable of the *The Two Houses* is heard, like a fable,[38] at two levels: at the level of the narratives of building and storm, and at the level of obedience and security, disobedience and judgment. Because of its cross-currents of interest, and even more importantly because of its emblematic metaphor, the level of its significance cannot be restricted to a single theme, or interest, or subject. πέτρα has a wide range of possible references, as the term emblematic implies.[39] In the Matthean parable, it has the following range: teaching, teacher, authority,[40] God, Messiah, Jesus (possibly Peter),[41] cosmos, dualism, life,[42] behaviour, worship, belief.[43] Because it has this range, key aspects of the Sermon on the Mount find in it a point of convergence. The theme of 'providence and obedience', the interest in wisdom, morality and the authority of Christ the Teacher, meet at this concluding point. It would appear that the imagery in the Matthean form of the parable makes it a rich climax to the Sermon. It is as if a hierarchy of pictures has been created.[44]

It would seem wise to conclude that this parable, with its Matthean structure and style, its 'fable' Gattung and literary interest, its emblematic metaphor and position as a rhetorical climax to an ancient assembly of logia and imagery, has a distinctive, literary function. Oral technique was capable of comparable subtlety; but in the written Gospel the form, style and content of this parable engage exactly with its literary context.

---

[38] Flusser, *Gleichnisse*, 60.

[39] The interlocking system of metaphors has widened to include groups (1QH 6:26; 1QS 11:8) and individuals (1QSa 1:12; 1QS 10:1): Muszyński, *Fundament.*

[40] See Mt 7:24,26,28.

[41] See 4QMess ar. There have been several recent attempts to find a context contemporary with Matthew's Gospel into which the promise to Peter in Mt 16:16 might fit: Peter was a juridical figure (Meier, *Antioch and Rome*); he was responsible for the transmission of revelation (Klein, *Traditionsgeschichte*, quoting Joseph and Asenath JA 15,7; Asenath, because of her faith, is a City of Refuge); Peter was a presbyteral mystagogue (Brent, *Charisma*). These attempts to place Mt 16:16 in a context contemporary with Matthew by no means exclude him from responsibility as a 'rock'. The mystagogal interpretation, for example, relates closely to worship in the New Temple, within which the mythology of the Old Temple finds a new kind of fulfilment.

[42] Muszyński, *Fundament*, Part II ch. 2, treats the mythical aspect of 'foundation'. The range of vocabulary used for the Matthean 'storm' (see ch.4 n.5) does not encourage the use of 'Flood' mythology here, but the metaphor is so powerful that it cannot be limited by its narrative context.

[43] Viviano, *Study as Worship.*

[44] See Olofsson, *Rock.*

(iii) *The Tradition*

The pre-Matthean tradition of the parable had a narrative conclusion and an in-built contrast. The concluding formula Mt 7:28 uses a traditional phrase τοὺς λόγους[45] τούτους,[46] which appears with variations in 13:53, 19:1

[45] What is the context in which the term λόγοι is to be understood? See Robinson, *Logoi Sophon*; Betz, *Sermon*, ch. 1. Neither of these provides a satisfactory place for λόγοι in relation to a genre for the Sermon on the Mount (Stanton, *Sermon*). Perhaps 'Instruction on which life and security depends, associated with λόγοι in Proverbs' (see Prov 1:24 LXX; 1:27, the house under threat of a storm) could provide a genre for λόγοι in 7:24. See also Young, *Parable*, 277 n.82.

[46] Schulz, *Q*, 312, regards τούτους as secondary. There are four points to be made: (i) The statistics of usage do not support either Lucan or Matthean redactional preference (Bergemann, *Prüfstand*, 222). A stylistic analysis of οὗτος is extremely complicated: it involves the various forms with numerically large usages, the variety of uses with and without the Definite Article, prepositional phrases, normal and idiomatic demonstrative uses, stock phrases, resumptive uses and particularly difficult textual problems. Employing the classification system from Chapter One, it is clear that there is no statistical support for Schulz's judgment. A specimen set of studies on the Nominative Singular offers a fair representation of the total picture:

Mt	32x	10x	Par Mk
		13x	Diff Mk=5x > ; 4x >*; 2x Plural for Singular; 1x σύ; 1x ἐκεῖνος
		8x	No Par
		1x	Par Lk
Mk	12x	10x	Par Mt
		1x	Diff Mt
		1x	>
Lk	39x	24x	No Par
		7x	Par Mk
		7x	Diff Mk
		1x	Par Mt

With the Definite Article and Participle:

Mt	7x	1x	Par Mk
		5x	Diff Mk (2x Marcan constructions)
		1x	No Par
Mk	3x	1x	Par Mt
		1x	Diff Mt
		1x	>
Lk	0x		

In every grouping, except the stock phrase τοῦτ' ἔστιν, the above pattern is evident: wherever Mt Diff Mk is represented, Mk Diff Mt or Mk >*Mt appear also. (ii) There are textual problems in 7:24-26. The uses of οὗτος in Mt 7:24,26 have question marks against them. The use in 7:28 has not. This corresponds to the overwhelming agreement of the MSS in 13:53, 19:1; and 26:1 also; i.e. in all the Matthean concluding formulae. (iii) The following phrases need to be noted: Lk 9:28,44 Diff Mk; Lk 24:17,44 No Par; Acts 2:22; 5:5,24. (iv) πᾶς and not οὗτος appears at Lk 7:1 in the Lucan form of the concluding formula.

and 26:1 and is part of the framework of the parable in 7:24 and 7:26. Lk 7:1 uses ῥήματα as against μου τῶν λόγων in Lk 6:47 and is thus parallel to Mt 7:28. That stage in the parable's history was also associated with the contrast between 'hearing' and 'doing' (Mt 7:21f; Lk 6:46f).[47]

The general relationship between the two halves of the parable in Q is not easy to interpret. The Matthean sections are linked with καὶ and the Lucan sections are contrasted by the use of δέ;[48] they give no clear structural indication whether the two halves in Q were related as complementary or as oppositional. In the later stages of the Q material this contrast was expressed in a fully antithetic form (Mt 7:13-14 Diff Lk 13:23-24; 7:21-23 Diff Lk 6:46). The contrast would have been appropriate to many different contexts. It would, for example, have been appropriate to the discussion of obedience and disobedience vis à vis the Law. It would have been equally appropriate, as we shall see, to the discussion of Jewish scholars regarding commitment to study and worship.[49]

A pre-Q form for the parable cannot be posited with absolute certainty. Beyer classifies Mt 7:24a as an example of a Semitic Conditional hidden within a paratactic construction. Although this may provide a useful approach in the treatment of some synoptic logia (e.g. Mt 5:23), in the case of others the available style of narration in Greek[50] may provide a better explanation. The geographical setting of the 'storm' and the 'house' has been used as evidence of a pre-Q form. It has been suggested that the Matthean form is Palestinian whereas the Lucan is Syrian. But these suggestions are unreliable. Matthew's version could just as well (probably better) be set in a Syrian city,[51] and the Lucan form need not be treated as

[47] Lk 6:46 has two distinctive features: the double κύριε κύριε, and the first-person Verb in the phrase ἃ λέγω. The double κύριε κύριε is rare in the New Testament (Mt 7:21,22; 25:11; Lk 13:25, which has a single κύριε, follows Lk 13:23-24=Mt 7:13-14, the saying about *The Narrow Gate*, and precedes Lk 13:26-27=Mt 7:22-23, the saying about *The Workers of Iniquity*). Some regard the first-person ἃ λέγω as secondary (2 Clem 13:2; Hahn, *Hoheitstitel*, 97; Bultmann, *Geschichte*, 148); but the synoptic material here has a complicated history which is probably best solved by assuming two separate traditions: Lk 6:46=Mt 7:21 on the one hand, and Lk 13:25ff=Mt 25:11 and 7:22 on the other (Wrege, *Überlieferung*, 148). If, as seems likely from its rhetorical form, Lk 6:46 is pre-Lucan, it is also probably pre-Lucan in its link with *The Two Houses*, requiring the hearer to go beyond a formal recognition of Christ as Lord.

[48] A review of the Particles in the antithetic parables which are listed in n.31 on p.181 suggests that this difference between Matthew and Luke may not be significant (see Schulz, *Q*, 314).

[49] Young, *Parables*, 258.

[50] See *Cor Fab Aesop Synt* 40.

[51] One approach is to relate the Matthean form of the parable to the fate of the Epiphania quarter of Antioch-on-Orontes, where the main street changed

non-Palestinian just because it refers to cellared buildings. Luz and Reiser[52] suggest a possible original setting for the parable in the Messiah's call for repentance. This is possible and would require an original antithetical form parallel to the saying in Lk 12:8f.

The emblematic metaphor of the 'rock' in *The Two Houses* has many associations within the New Testament tradition. The synoptic evidence points to the 'stone sayings' and the 'building sayings' as material of considerable antiquity,[53] perhaps used by Jesus of himself and of his work.[54] The evidence of the epistles indicates the strength of this imagery particularly in relation to the nature and growth of the church. So it is possible that the metaphorical base of *The Two Houses* goes back behind the Q material to a use in the life of Jesus.[55]

In conclusion to this section on tradition, the early history of the parable can best be explored either in terms of a parallel to Lk 12:8f or in terms of its emblematic metaphor; the earliest Q tradition may have used the parable as illustration of a discussion on 'hearing' and 'doing'; the later Q parable developed exactly balancing parts and a fable-type narration in a tradition influenced by Sirach. The Lucan form contrasted confession with the lips as against confession by deeds as the test for belonging to the Christian community for Gentile and for Jew.[56]

(iv) *Its Distinctiveness within the History of Parables*

The parable has a unique history. It can be classified either as a literary development of a 'fable-type parable' or as a developed 'geminate parable'. Apparently didactic in purpose, it provides a rhetorical climax to the Sermon on the Mount, bringing together the imagery of the Sermon by means of its metaphors, its traditional pictures, its contrasts and the 'fable-like' character of its narrative.

(v) *Its Relation to Matthean Redaction*

The effect of these developments within *The Two Houses* is to produce a fable-type narrative capable of being used and understood in any environment. The final Matthean form of *The Two Houses* matches the

---

direction as a result of the Parmenius torrent, which poured down into the Orontes from the mountain behind the city. In the winter season this torrent was fed by mountain storms pouring through the Onopnictes, washing down stones and debris from Mount Silpius. It was against such damage that the Emperor Tiberius enlarged and reinforced passages in the city to carry the water and debris away.

[52] Luz, *Matthäus*, I 413; Reiser, *Gerichtspredigt*, 310.

[53] Moule, *Birth*, 71.

[54] Meyer, *Aims*, 275 n.75.

[55] Heininger, *Metaphorik*, 138.

[56] Evans, *Luke*, 340.

content of the Sermon on the Mount, which unites within the teaching of Jesus wisdom of biblical and secular character, and the legal traditions with their interpretation by God's Son. Betz maintains that the position of the parable at the conclusion of the Sermon is also based on a secular parallel.[57] In this way the story endorses the universal authority of the teacher, representing the decisive character of the Son's revelation and the interpretation of the Law given by the fully empowered agent of God. As Chapter Three indicated,[58] *The Two Houses* can be examined in the light of the other summary parables. It is a testimony to the universal authority of God's Son.[59] Its function within Matthew is better understood when the summary parables, and especially the parable of *The Two Houses* and *The Sheep and the Goats*, are examined together. The balance between the First and the Fifth discourse and between *The Two Houses* and *The Sheep and the Goats* indicates the theological as well as the structural significance of these parables. *The Two Houses* ends the Sermon on the Mount with a warning about the divine judgment which will reveal the true character of all those who are obedient and those who are disobedient to the way of Christ; *The Sheep and the Goats* ends the Eschatological Discourse with a vision of the Son of Man, who confirms at the future judgment the nature of the obedience which is required now. The two parables are complementary evidence for Matthew's interest in a universal ethic, the confirmation of which lies beyond the present.

B. *The Householder* Mt 13:52

(i) *The Context*

The context of this brief parable is the section beginning 11:1 and ending with 13:53.[60] The parable follows the conversation in 13:51 συνήκατε ταῦτα πάντα; λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· Ναί. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν,[61] and can be treated as an

---

[57] Betz, *Sermon*, 15 n.76.

[58] See ch.3 pp.121-123.

[59] Wong, *Interkulturelle*, 50; Balch, *Political Topos*, 83.

[60] See ch.3 pp.115-117 for the view that the concluding formulae are the most reliable demarcations within the Matthean material.

[61] ταῦτα πάντα may be regarded as the content of the private conversation: Luz, *Matthäus*, 1/2 362; it is the hidden mysteries now revealed to the disciples alone (Orton, *Scribe*, 144). There are several issues here: First, what is the status of the phrase ταῦτα πάντα: should it be regarded as a phrase with special associations, or should it be treated strictly by context, or should it be regarded as a loose formula? Second, what is the significance of the word order (see Luz, *Matthäus*, I 47, 'Aus trad ταῦτα πάντα macht M. πτ"')? Third, how does the phrase relate to theories concerning the Matthean view of discipleship?

The statistics are as follows (ττ/ππ indicates the word order):

Mt 12x:	1x No Par	13:51	(ττ)
	1x Par Mk	19:20	(all the law ττ; Mk ττ)
	6x Diff Mk	13:34	(of teaching to the crowds ττ)
		13:56	(of Jesus' σοφία and δυνάμεις ττ; Mk >*)
		24:2	(of Jerusalem ττ; Mk ταῦτας...οἰκοδομὰς)
		24:8	(of end-time ππ; Mk >*)
		24:33	(of end-time ππ; Mk τ Lk τ)
		24:34	(of end-time ππ; Mk ττ Lk π)
	1x Par Lk	6:32	(ππ; Lk ττ)
	3x Diff Lk	4:9	(ττ; Lk >*)
		6:33	(ττ; Lk τ)
		23:36	(of warnings ττ; Lk >*)
Mk 4x:	1x Par Mt	10:20	(ττ)
	3x Diff Mt	7:23	(of evil ππ)
		13:4	(of end-time ττ: Mt συντελεία; Lk τ)
		13:30	(of end-time ττ: Mt ππ)
Lk 5x:	2x No Par	16:14	(of parables ττ)
		21:36	(of end-time ττ)
	1x Par Mk	18:21	(ττ)
	1x Diff Mk	24:9	(ττ; Mk > ; Mt=Lk ἀπαγγέλλω; Mt > ττ)
	1x Par Mt	12:30	(ττ)

On the question of text, the following have strongly supported variant word order: Mt 6:33; 19:20; 23:36; 24:2,33. The reasons for the divergences may be: influence from synoptic parallels, dittography from proximate passages, or association from other parts of Matthew. 24:33 is the most vulnerable. There are parallels to the use of ταῦτα πάντα (Orton, *Scribe*, 146-147): Deut 4:30, 30:1; 4 Ezra 6:33; and Dan 12:7; so that it has been classed as a semi-technical, apocalyptic phrase. The safest answers to our opening questions are: it would be unwise to regard any of the uses as having a special meaning except by immediate association within the eschatological discourses; that context is decisive in a number of cases; the classification of 'generalized formulaic use' should certainly be considered for three passages: Mt 13:34,51 and Lk 16:14. The textual uncertainties make a definition of a Matthean redactional use of πάντα ταῦτα, in that order, with a precise apocalyptic meaning, very difficult. Mk 7:23, 13:4, 13:30 make it more so. Those who regard the phrase as apocalyptically freighted must explain why Matthew changes it at precisely the point where an apocalyptic catch-all phrase is needed. Those two factors, the range of uses of πάντα ταῦτα and its generalized use, make a precise meaning at 13:51 extremely suspect. To call Mt 4:9, 6:32, 6:33 and 19:20 a use of double entendre is to treat Matthew as confused and confusing. If on the other hand the generalized formulaic use is accepted in principle, then all the uses can be seen potentially in that light. Most important of the generalized formulae is Mt 13:34, since 13:51 is heard as a back-reference to it, but 13:34 refers to the teaching given to the crowd. The question therefore is: could 13:51, even though it is part of a private conversation between Jesus and the disciples, refer to all the parabolic teaching (with the hidden revelations of 13:35) and not only to 13:36-50? It seems to me that this wider reference is very likely. Further evidence for this will be considered in the discussion of ch. 13 as a whole. See Kingsbury,

explanation of what the conversation implies. It can also be treated as the question and concluding parable of 13:1-52. The Chapter of Parables concludes with the parable and the concluding formula. They demarcate the end of the discourse, and the question to the disciples prepares the way for the concluding parable. But from the point of view of Matthew's compositional methods, 13:52 can most satisfactorily be understood as the conclusion of an even longer section, the section 11:1–13:53. The pattern can be built up as follows.[62] At the end of ch. 10 Matthew continues with material which he had begun to use in the Sermon on the Mount (Mt 11:1-11/Lk 7:18-28; Mt 11:16-19/Lk 7:31-35, following Lk 6:20-49 and 7:1-10).[63] If this source provided the editor with a further guideline in 11:20, which seems possible, then the rest of the chapter would be Q material also (Mt 11:20-27/Lk 10:12-22), extended to Mt 11:28-30. At that point

---

Parables, 125-129; Schweizer, *Matthew*, 314-316; Carlston, *Triple Tradition*, 3-51. The concept of discipleship becomes important at this point of the argument: are the disciples thought to be those to whom a special private revelation is given, or do they belong to a special category such as that to which the scribe of Sirach belonged? Or are the disciples not to be conceived of as a separate specialized group, but as a window on all Christians? The discipleship concept affects how the parabolic picture in 13:52 is used. If the disciples are to become privileged scholars like scribes, then the privilege of scribes, as those who possess 'the new', controls the picture. If all disciples are to understand as the scribes do, then the picture becomes unclear but challenging: in what sense do 'scribes' bring out old and new? (Luz, *Matthäus*, 1/2 362-363). Further on μαθητής, see p.200 n.91.

[62] The time phrase in Mt 13:1 is a connecting link; the flow of material can be summarized as follows:

The end of the Mission Discourse Mt	11:1	(No Lucan parallel)
The Baptist's Question	11:2-6	Q (Lk 7:18-23)
Jesus' Testimony to John	11:7-19	Q (Lk 7:24-35 + 16:16)
Woes on the Galilean Cities	11:20-24	Q (Lk 10:13-15)
Thanksgiving to the Father	11:25-27	Q (Lk 10:21-22)
Comfort for the heavy-laden	11:28-30	No Par
The Lightened Load (i)	12:1-8	Mk
The Lightened Load (ii)	12:9-16	Mk + Q
The Merciful Son	12:17-21	No Par
Son of David & 'broken reeds'	12:22-30	Mk + Q
Spirit, endowment and truth	12:31-37	Mk + Q
An unrepentant generation	12:38-45	Mk + Q
Jesus' true family	12:46-50	Mk
Hearing and understanding	13:1ff	Mk

[63] Mt 11:20-24 occupies a position after the 'Mission Discourse' and before the Thanksgiving to the Father, comparable to that of Lk 10:13-15. Lk 10:13-15 was attracted to its present position in Luke by Lk 10:12 (Manson, *Sayings*, 77), perhaps displacing 10:16 and rendering dispensable any introduction (parallel to Mt 11:20) which Lk 10:13-15 might have had. Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 60ff, treats Mt 11:20 as a historicizing connection.

Matthew would have reserved the logion on 'hearing and seeing' (Lk 10:23-24) for later use in the discourse on parables.[64] From the beginning of ch. 12 the final editor follows Mark, although probably not our version of Mark,[65] until the overlap between the Marcan and Q material is reached at Mk 3:20-26, Mt 12:22-26 and Lk 11:14-18. Matthew then takes up Q again (Mt 12:22-30/Lk 11:14-23, the parables of the βασιλεία, πόλις and the οἰκία) except for two sections: Mt 12:31f/Mk 3:28-30 and Mt 12:46-50/Mk 3:31-35. This leads into the parables' discourse in Mk 4:1ff/Mt 13:1ff.

From this outline of Matthew's integration of Mark and Q material it is possible to infer the structure of Mt 11:1–13:52. Mt 11:1-24[66] concerns judgment, repentance, and John the Baptist (including the παιδία parable 11:16-19). From 11:25 there is continuous flow of material with a focus on the Father's revelation through the Son,[67] a revelation withheld from the σοφοί and revealed to the νήπιοι. This continues at least as far as Mt 13:15. If 12:1ff is more than a change of source, and connects thematically with 11:30, then 12:1-8 and 12:9-16 illustrate how the ζυγός of Jesus Christ is lighter because of the wise use of the Sabbath laws validated by the cult (12:5) and by humanitarian concern (12:11).[68] The material in 12:22ff is given cohesion[69] through the use of the Old Testament quotation in 12:18-21,[70] where the universal significance of the Son's reticence is given prophetic authorization. Connections with Mt 13 are also evident: people are made to hear and see (12:22), to bear 'good fruit' if they are 'good trees' (12-33), by which is meant, among other things, that, as part of the battle between evil and God's Spirit, they use wholesome speech (12:34,36).[71] Another picture relevant to 13:52 is ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ θησαυροῦ ἐκβάλλει ἀγαθά (12:35). Despite his reticence the Son is victorious (12:29); he is spirit-endowed (12:31-32), as the parables of the

---

64 Mt 13:13-15,18f,23,51f relate closely with this Q logion.

65 Aichinger, *Ährenraufen*, 141.

66 For 11:2-24 as a unit, see Deutsch, *Wisdom*, 30.

67 Verseput, *Christology*, 543; Cope, *Matthew*, 32ff; Luz, *Christologie*, 233; Hill, *Son and Servant*, 2-16; Nolan, *Son*, 178; Dunn, *Christology*, 137f, 200f; Allison, *Son of God*, 74f.

68 Sigal, *Halakah*.

69 Cope, *Matthew*, 80, regards the material as 'built round' the OT quotation. Neyrey, *Matthew 12*, 472, finds a broad correspondence between Isa 42 and Matthew 11:17-24, 12:2-40. The Isa 42 reference however goes beyond these passages: see especially 11:28-30, compared with 12:19.

70 Grindel, *Matthew*, 110-115; Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 72-77; Strecker, *Gerechtigkeit*, 67ff; McConnell, *Law*, 124.

71 Schulz, *Q*, 316f. The practical question of 'speech' indicates the instructional use of the picture sayings. See ch.3 p.129, and ch.4 p.181.

βασιλεία and the οἰκία remind the reader,[72] and because of this the reader enjoys the privileges and responsibilities of belonging to God's family.[73]

Mt 11:1–13:53 cannot be described as thematically controlled, nor does it give the impression of being structured to deliver a single theological message. The material used in 11:1–12:50 has nevertheless a sufficient range of interests and emphases in common with the parables' discourse to make the continuity of the three chapters as noteworthy as their literary divisions. Instruction, advice, hearing and seeing, the Son's victory over evil, and a common fund of images link 11:1–12:50 with the chapter which follows.

What of the immediate context of 13:52? The parables' discourse has sometimes been divided into two parts at 13:36,[74] which would, if it were correct, affect the function of 13:52. The later treatment of this discourse will show what kind of shift occurs at 13:36. The near context of 13:52 offers, in all, four main possible points of reference: the parables, their interpretation, the Old Testament quotation in 13:35 and the uses of συνιέναι in 13:13,15, and 51.

(ii) *The Redaction*

The following comments need to be made about the key linguistic elements in 13:52:

διὰ τοῦτο...[75] 'So you see...'

---

72 Baumbach, *Bösen*, 81f, 111ff, relates the pictures of the 'house' and the 'Kingdom' to the divisive power of evil and the uniting power of the Spirit in 12:22-30, 13:36-43. The power of Satan is related specifically to the work of false prophets and those who practise hypocrisy. See ch.4 pp.270-272.

73 See Mt 12:46-50. Senior, *Passion*, 14 n.1, sees the 'disciples' as an undefined group; this is preferable to Kingsbury, *Matthew*, 33-34, and van Tilborg, *Jewish Leaders*, 161, who fails to mention that where Matthew differs from Mark there are Lucan parallels. See ch.4 pp.200-202.

74 Kingsbury, *Parables*, 12-16.

75 How precise a connection with the context does διὰ τοῦτο provide? According to Thompson, *Divided Community*, 257, διὰ τοῦτο in 18:23 'explains the previous application [that is, the parable illustrates the previous saying about unlimited forgiveness] and establishes the basis for the following doctrinal statement and application [that the Father will punish those who do not forgive]'. The parable has a single point and διὰ τοῦτο links the immediate context to that point. Linnemann takes a different view in *Parables*, 106-107: according to her, διὰ τοῦτο makes a loose connection with the whole previous chapter. Oesterley, *Parables*, 93-94, denies a logical connection with the immediate context; he contrasts what the Western mind sees in ch. 18 as a lack of logical connection in 18:23 with the Oriental discursiveness of storytelling. The argument for a loose connection in the case of a narrative parable is strong. How clearly redactional is διὰ τοῦτο?

Mt	10x	3x No Par	13:52	and 18:23; see above.
			21:43	A classic invective threat, beginning 'so inevitably'.
		1x Par Mk	14:2	Explanatory: 'and that is why...'
		2x Diff Mk	12:31	There is no obvious link between 12:30 and 12:31. Is διὰ τοῦτο an echo of 12:27? See below.
			13:13	The 'reason' for the parable is: διὰ τοῦτο...ὅτι(because) (Mk ἵνα).
		3x Par Lk	6:25	= 'if you take God seriously then...' Piper, *Wisdom*, 35; Catchpole, *Ravens*; a loose prospective and retrospective link.
			12:27:	Either = 'is it not in that case', or 'They suggest you are mistaken. So...'
			23:34	= a classic prophetic invective threat beginning 'So inevitably...'
		1x Diff Lk	24:44	If you hear the parable and understand, then you will be ready.
Mk	3x	1x Par Mt	6:14;	see above.
		2x >*Mt	11:24	Faith is effective, so pray: this is a loosely constructed argument.
			12:24	Prospective: 'Are you not then...'
Lk	4x	3x Par Mt		See above.
		1x No Par	14:20	Parabolic dialogue: 'so...'

Other Particles used to introduce Matthean parables are:

Mt	7:24	Diff Lk >	οὖν: A summary use. See above.
	11:16	Diff Lk οὖν	δέ resumes the question in 11:7.
	13:3	Par Mk	ἰδού.
	13:18	Diff Mk	οὖν marks the hearers' task.
	13:37	No Par	δέ links the circumstantial narrative to the interpretation.
	13:45,47	No Par	πάλιν.
	19:24	Par Mk	πάλιν δέ.
	20:1	No Par	γάρ relates the parable to 19:30.
	21:28	No Par	τί δὲ ὑμῖν δοκεῖ;
	22:1	Diff Lk	πάλιν.
	24:43	Par Lk	The parable is introduced by a warning which reappears after 24:42ff; διὰ τοῦτο draws some of the consequence. See Mt 24:44.
	24:45	Par Lk	τίς ἄρα. In neither Gospel is the ἄρα used with a logical inference. See ch.4 p.211 n.133, and Marshall, *Luke*, 540.
	25:1	No Par	τότε
	25:14	Diff Lk οὖν	ὥσπερ γάρ. See p.338 n.220.
	25:31	No Par	δέ.

Neither in the review of διὰ τοῦτο nor in the review of Particles used with the parables is there encouragement for the suggestion that Matthew is interested in using introductory phrases or Particles to apply parables precisely to surrounding arguments or statements.

διὰ τοῦτο occurs at 18:23 also, introducing the final parable of the discourse there. In 18:23ff the longer parable makes possible a secure judgment on the force of the initial adverbial phrase. διὰ τοῦτο refers to the whole chapter and not only to the previous conversation; it does not provide a strictly logical connection between Peter's conversation with Jesus and the parable, but it brings together elements of concern basic to the whole previous chapter. The parable it introduces is haggadic and not simply illustrative in a narrow sense.

πᾶς + Noun = Participle[76]
This construction is rare in the New Testament and in the LXX. It occurs where a sonorous periphrasis is required, as in threats (Mt 3:10/Lk 3:9: see Mt 7:19), or in parables (Mt 12:25 (2x)/Lk 11:17; see Jn 15:2 and Lk 2:23 (Ex 13:2)). As a subject, but without the Participle, πᾶς + Noun belongs to proverbs, threats and promises, as well as to general statements. As subject without the Participle but followed by ὅστις, rarely in the NT but frequently in the LXX, it belongs to blessings and curses. On syntactical grounds the theory that 13:52 is a Jewish Wisdom saying with a Christian qualification is possible.

γραμματεύς. Matthew's use of the word betrays traditional formulations and a variety of usage which cannot easily be traced to a single editor and a single Sitz im Leben.[77] Not even the famous addition αὐτῶν[78] is a secure

---

[76] For the Wisdom use of the construction, see Prov 19:6,7; Sir 13:15; 14:17; 15:13; 17:20; 18:28; 19:20; 37:7. With a relative clause it appears in Mt 15:13 and 18:18. For the construction with a Participle, see Lev 7:10 (a legal prescription), Num 18:15 (a legal prescription), Sir 14:19 (with an Adverbial Participle).

[77] Klijn, *Scribes*, 259-267; Orton, *Scribe*, 177-178. Both comment on the remarkable disagreement between the Gospel writers in their use of labels.
The uses of γραμματεύς are (Schenk, *Sprache*, 65):

Mt 24x
- 8x No Par
  - 1x (2:4) τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ γραμματεῖς τοῦ λαοῦ
  - 3x (5:20; 12:38) τῶν γραμματέων καὶ Φαρισαίων
  - 1x (13:52) πᾶς γραμματεύς
  - 1x (21:15) οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς
  - 1x (23:2) οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι
  - 1x (23:15) γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι
- 7x Diff Lk
  - 1x (8:19) εἷς γραμματεύς (Lk 9:57 τις)
  - 5x (23:13 23:23; 23:25,27,29) γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι (see 23:15)
  - 1x (23:34) προφήτας καὶ σοφοὺς καὶ γραμματεῖς
- 8x Par Mk

1x (17:10) οἱ γραμματεῖς
1x (7:29) οἱ γραμματεῖς αὐτῶν (see Lk 5:30 Diff Mt)
1x (15:1) Φαρισαῖοι καὶ γραμματεῖς (Mk καί τινες)
1x (16:21) τ. πρεσβυτέρων καὶ ἀρχιερέων καὶ γραμματέων
1x (20:18) τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσιν καὶ (Mt τοῖς) γραμματεῦσιν
1x (27:41) οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς μετά
τῶν γραμματέων (Mk >) καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων
1x (26:57) οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι
Mk ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ γραμματεῖς
1x (9:3) τινες τῶν γραμματέων
Lk 5:21 οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι

1x Text?

Mk 21x:

8x Par Mt

6x >

4x Diff Mt

1x (2:16) οἱ γραμματεῖς τῶν Φαρισαίων
(Mt οἱ Φαρισαῖοι)
(Lk οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς αὐτῶν)
2x (3:22; 12:28) οἱ γραμματεῖς (ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλημ)
(Mt οἱ Φαρισαῖοι)
1x (14:1) οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς (see Mt 21:15)
(Mt πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ)

3x >*Mt

1x (11:27) οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς και οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι
(Mt 21:23 οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτ. τοῦ λαοῦ)
1x (14:43) (See Mt 26:47)
1x (15:1) (See Lk 22:66 πρεσβυτέριον τοῦ λαοῦ
ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι και οἱ γραμματεῖς)

Lk 14x:

4x No Par

1x (23:10) οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς
1x (20:39) τινες τῶν γραμματέων
2x (11:53; 15:2) οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς/οἱ Φαρισαῖοι
See Mt No Par 23:2

8x Par Mk

2x Diff Mk

1x (20:19) οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς
1x (6:7) οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι

Orton, *Scribe*, 28-38, criticizes Cook's judgment that Matthew's scribes are linked with Pharisees and other groups in Matthew because Matthew's concept of scribe is too weak for him to allow them to stand alone. Orton prefers the view that Matthew has a clear view of their role in the story; they are opponents of Jesus and as such can properly be linked with or called Pharisees. The same implication can be read into 7:29, 9:3, 17:10. But Matthew is aware that only some of them are opponents; the remainder are courteous learners and genuine enquirers. 8:19, 13:52 and 23:34 are thoroughly positive uses. They are the ideal scribes. There is no doubt that this solution answers some of the questions. Whether it is a satisfactory explanation of all the features of the synoptic

guide to the Sitz im Leben. It is sometimes claimed that it represents a confrontation between Christian and Jewish scribes. But Luke makes the same alteration in 5:30 Diff Mk, referring to the 'scribes belonging to the Pharisees'. 23:43,[79] possibly 10:41,[80] and 13:52 support the theory that Christian scribes were known to the editor, without the content of the word 'scribe' being made explicit. Opposition to 'scribes and Pharisees' is clear from 23:13,15, and in two cases Mark's use of 'scribes and Pharisees' is conflated by Matthew into 'Pharisees', although the possibility of traditional terminology in the synoptic tradition has to be considered.[81]

The historical problem raised by this term is discussed by Neusner in his analysis of the Eliezer ben Hyrcanus traditions.[82] Using Josephus's evidence, he suggests that the pre-70 'scribe' held the position of a professional teacher of the Law, distinguishing this profession from the sectarian character of Pharisaic piety, and from political and civil authority. He identifies Eliezer's position as akin to the cultic and humanitarian easing of the Law found in the synoptic tradition, particularly in the Matthean tradition, and his role at Yavneh primarily as legislating for those under Pharisaic discipline in the post-70 period, where the amalgamation of Pharisaic and scribal traits was a characteristic phenomenon. While Neusner does not consider the particular problems raised by the presence in the Matthean redaction of traditional and probably earlier elements, he does clarify the nature of the scribe's responsibilities in the Yavnean period. This

---

relationships indicated above is a different matter. For example, even assuming the solution which Orton offers, we have still to explain why in two of Mk Diff Mt examples Matthew has οἱ Φαρισαῖοι where Mark has οἱ γραμματεῖς τῶν Φαρισαίων, and yet Matthew, Mt No Par, Mt Diff Mk, Mt Diff Lk, prefers different formulations. Even if it is argued that there is a consistency of approach behind the formulation, there is a lack of consistency in the choice of the formulations. More important is the assumption that an 'apocalyptic' solution to the γραμματεύς problem is a key to the entire Gospel. Klein, *Frömmigkeit*, is correct when he indicates the different kinds of piety which are represented in Matthew's Gospel, some of which are associated with γραμματεύς. It is one thing to assume a common background for the γραμματεύς of Mt 13:34-52 and Mt 23, but another to assume they are part of a common ecclesiology and piety.

[78] 7:29. See Kilpatrick, *Matthew*, 110-111.

[79] Garland, *Matthew 23*, 174-175. See also ch.3 pp.149-150.

[80] Künzel, *Studien*, 178.

[81] The uses of the Definite Article in the material set out in n.77 (p.195) may best be explained by a theory of interchanging formulae reflecting various traditions.

[82] Neusner, *Eliezer*, 298-334. Mason, *Pharisees*, has established that Josephus's attitude to the Pharisees had personal causes, and that, as an avowed élitist, he disdained the Pharisees and their popular following, but never attacked Pharisaic piety. He shared their goal that the Law should be handled with care.

is particularly important in view of the part which this term plays in Goulder's hypothesis.[83]

Orton's[84] contribution to the discussion explains a good part of the Matthean material. He argues that Matthew removes from the tradition some implicit criticisms made of the scribes and, remaining within Jewish categories, presents the scribes in a positive light (8:19f; 23:2; 13:52; 23:34). The contemporary scribal ideal can, Orton argues, be built up from Ezra, the intertestamental literature, especially Sirach, and Qumran: the scribal ideal consists in the gift of understanding (e.g. parables and mysteries), custody of community values, righteous teaching, mantic prophecy and creative insight. The disciples of Jesus in Matthew are to conform to that ideal. The scribes believe that they receive direct insight from God. The theory of a 'scribal ideal' has been questioned on the grounds that not all the documentation specifically claims to be 'scribal'. The evidence from Qumran of mantic scribes is however secure. The evidence for a positive affirmation in Matthew of scribal activity is also secure.

μαθητευθείς 'Who has become a disciple'.

On grammatical grounds it is difficult to say if this is a Deponent Verb or a true Passive.[85] Its translation is best approached from its associative field. If in 28:16-20 two elements contribute to μαθητεύειν, namely βαπτίζοντες and διδάσκοντες, then μαθητεύειν implies both 'incorporation' and 'instruction'. By 'incorporation' in Matthean terms[86] is meant specifically to become part of the community of the disciples through baptism, instruction, discipline and world-wide mission, and to enjoy the

[83] Goulder, *Midrash*, 3-27; von Dobschütz, *Matthäus*, 338-348.

[84] Orton, *Scribe*; Hickling, *Review*.

[85] The relation of the Passive Participle to possible Transitive and Intransitive forms of the Verb is uncertain: Strecker, *Gerechtigkeit*, 192 n.3; Trilling, *Wahre Israel*, 4 n.14. The element of instruction is a fixed point: Baumbach, *Mission*, 158ff: 'one who has become a disciple'. On the production of transitive forms by analogy with Semitic morphological shifts, see Silva, *Semitisms*, 255 n.9. The Deponent use is supported by Ignatius's mission terminology: Walker, *Heilsgeschichte*, 27 n.44; Frankemölle, *Jahwebund*, 144 n.304; Künzel, *Studien*, 176-177.

[86] Trilling, *Wahre Israel*, 16 and n.69. 'Incorporation' means to become part of a Christian community in which God is present in Christ (18:20; 28:20) through support, empowering, deliverance experienced in instruction, baptism, common discipline, leadership and commitment to mission. (On the apotropaic aspect of Christ's work in early traditions, see Grayston, *Dying, We Live*, 391.) For Matthew the sovereignty of God, affirmed within the good news of the Kingdom, brings to that life and mission a universal authority.

powerful protection of the Holy Spirit[87] with the context of the Kingdom of Heaven;[88] by 'instruction' is meant the teaching of Jesus in particular,

---

[87] The transcendence of the Holy Spirit in Matthew is marked by the phrase 'The Father's Spirit' (10:20 Diff Mk 13:11), as if to parallel the disciples' experience with that of Christ at his baptism (Weaver, *Missionary*, 102), and the transcendent character of heavenly insight (13:35) is not far away. Ziesler, *Matthew*, notes that the presence of the Spirit in Jesus according to Mark is not found in Matthew, and that Matthew has a tendency to omit Mark's references to unclean spirits (the only survivor from 14 in Mark is Mt 10:8/Mk 6:7). The emphasis moves away from spectacular evidences of the Spirit's work to holiness of action (7:21ff). The baptismal formula (28:19) has been traced to Dan 7:13-14 (Schaberg, *Father*); if correct, it suggests how the baptized share in a holy vision (25:31ff; 19:26ff) of Christ's exaltation (see also Hubbard, *Matthew*, 28). The elements of this transcendent approach to the Spirit can be paralleled in Chrysostom of Antioch's pneumatology: the shifting of Spirit language toward the moral (Chrysostom, *Ad Acta Homilies*), the avoidance of identifications between Christ's power and the Spirit's grace (*In Illud Dominum* II 3.276 is a rare example of identification), the emphasis on the Spirit's holiness (*Peri Akataleptou* III.2) and the association of the Spirit with baptism (less certainly as evidence for Chrysostom, *The Baptismal Homilies*).

[88] Four areas of Matthew's βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν usage were designated on p.137: the Father's will, Jesus and the disciples as the focus of conflict with evil, the ultimate validity of justice, and commitment to God in willing obedience. These can be expanded in relation to 13:52. The convergence of the myth of the divine rule, the motifs of the 'Holy War' (22:2: Derrett, *Law*, 126ff) and 'Covenant' (26:28-29), on divine sovereignty and the Father's will (6:10; 7:21; 21:31: Senior, *Passion*, 375f), lead in Mt 13:52 and 28:18-20 to an emphasis on divine protection and judgment, and the rewards of obedience and the perils of disobedience, personal and corporate (5:3,19). The relating of βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν to the history of Jesus (on 4:23; 9:35; 10:7, see Frankemölle, *Jahwebund*, 103, 380; on 12:25ff, see Davies, *Sermon*, 46-60) and to his cross (16:28; 26:2), leads to a stress on following the way of the Son of Man. The John the Baptist tradition (3:2), with its call for repentance and righteousness (see also the absolute use of βασιλεία in 6:33, and Schweizer, *Matthew*, 166; on 11:11f, see Sand, *Gesetz*, 181), and the future judgment presented in the Jesus tradition in all its traditional imagery and associations, illustrate the central role of the Kingdom in the clash between tyranny and holiness. Justice is to be established (8:11f; 19:23f; 26:69; 25:34; on 4:17, see Strecker, *Gerechtigkeit*, 95-96; on 13:1,19,24,31,33,38-52, see Kingsbury, *Parables*; on the day-to-day implications of the Kingdom, see Thysman, *Communauté*; on 19:12, see van Tilborg, *Jewish Leaders*; on 21:43 and 23:13 see Mussner, *Antijudaismus*, 129-134; on the use of the time before the End for good works, see 24:13; 25:1ff, and Lambrecht, *Parousia*). The qualities of life within the Kingdom expand into community life and commitment; they establish a new history for the people of God (ch. 18). The term βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν is neither wholly rabbinic nor wholly Gentile, but is appropriate to both because of the Semitic and Greek implication of transcendence in the Plural τῶν οὐρανῶν (Kretzer, *Herrschaft*, 19-64). These four elements, expanded in relation to 13:52 and 28:18-20, indicate that Kretzer's and Kingsbury's cosmic, spatial and salvation-historical

although the nuances of this must be discussed later, under the three areas of 'salvation-history', 'Law' and 'understanding'. On these nuances depends the extent to which 'scribal' experience prior to discipleship is being evaluated positively or negatively,[89] or whether it is being considered at all.[90]

The discussion of μαθητής in Matthew is a controversial area, partly because the traditional elements in the Matthean narrative have not always been recognized and so linguistic studies have produced discrepant results,[91] and partly because there are different possible approaches to the subject: the narrative approach (how the disciples respond and change within the narrative), the 'window on Matthew's church' approach (what the disciples tell us about the primary implied readers), and the discourse approach (their

---

categories for discussion of the Kingdom in Matthew are insufficient; their attempt to place the Kingdom in a confrontation between Judaism and Gentile Christianity is unsatisfactory; and their literary methods are inappropriate to the material. For a theological context for the discussion of the Kingdom, see Soskice, *Metaphor*; Osborn, *Emergence*.

[89] Orton, *Scribe*, 152.

[90] Luz, *Matthäus*, 362.

[91] μαθητής (Schenk, *Sprache*, 392; Strecker, *Gerechtigkeit*, 191f). The uses of this term cause several difficulties:

(i) Read as a narrative, 5:1 and 7:28 offer the following picture: the audience presupposed is a somewhat loosely constructed picture of crowds following Jesus who respond in amazement (7:28), with disciples also among the followers. Greater precision beyond that can only be attained through poorly attested evidence regarding redactional activity, as is employed by van Tilborg, *Jewish Leaders*, 160; see Martinez, *Matthew 18*, and Freyne, *Twelve*, ch. 9); the text does not require even Minear's milder picture of the disciples ministering to the crowd (*Disciples*, 32f).

(ii) In 9:11f and 12:1ff the synoptic problem of Minor Agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark in Marcan contexts is a substantive issue. In 9:18-25 there are 12 such Minor Agreements (Neirynck, *Minor Agreement*, 101ff; on 12:1ff see Neirynck, 257ff). This makes the judgment on redactional responsibility in these passages particularly problematic. These are significant passages (Held, *Wundergeschichten*, 168ff; Gatzweiler, *Miracles*, 214); 12:1f is sometimes regarded as a section where Matthew is widening the area of comparison between disciples and the Matthean congregation; so questions of redactional responsibility are crucial to the argument (Luz, *Jünger*; Frankemölle, *Amtskritik*). An agreement in the use of μαθηταί between Matthew and Luke at Mt 13:10 (see Lk 8:9; Mk 4:10) could also be suggestive of a generalizing process in the development of the tradition, the word μαθηταί being used for a wide group of adherents. On the status of disciples in Mt 18-19, see ch.3 p.157.
(iii) In 12:49f the disciples are an undefined group. They are encouraged to see themselves as those who are obedient to the Father's will (Kingsbury, *Structure*, 33-34, uses precision where Matthew does not; see Senior, *Passion*, 14 n.1).

role within a religious document aimed at transforming the readership).[92] If traditional elements within the narrative are recognized as integral to the interpretative process, the attempt to define μαθητής and μαθητεύω by usage reveals an expanding and contracting picture; it becomes clear that the relationships of the crowds to the disciples have to be studied narratively and discursively, and not only as a window on the primary leadership or congregational readership. There are historical factors, in relation to Peter, and also in relation to 'the twelve'. The three main approaches can also explore the many forms of learning, understanding, serving, believing, teaching, advising, healing, forgiving, ministering, and relating in responsible obedience, which are all elements belonging to the Matthean presentation of discipleship. These are all part of the Matthean approach; it is a distinctive approach which includes the specific issues of failure and denial, life-style and discipline, self-denial and singleness of purpose, responsibilities to the past and for the future, denial of status and humiliation, baptism and mission.[93] Mission is a key area of responsibility for the disciples in Matthew, as the Verb μαθητεύω indicates: it has missionary associations in Matthew, in Acts, and in Ignatius.[94] The replacement of the disciples by children, who are the model for following

[92] I am grateful to Daniel Patte for his paper to the Cambridge SNTS Matthew Seminar: *Prolegomena to a study of the Disciples in Matthew*, in which he analysed these three approaches to the question.

[93] Illustrative of this variety is Mt 13, where again the agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark are surprisingly numerous, as the later study will show. Ch. 13 can be read narratively, with note taken of the changing places and audiences. The relation of what is taught in these changing circumstances is not always transparently clear. The reason for this is that behind the narrative stands a process of compilation. Some units of tradition are independent of the narrative and the agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark explain that independence. They have been separate units of tradition which Matthew has not systematically integrated into the narrative. When one of those agreements, Mt 13:10=Lk 8:9 Diff Mk 4:10, introduces μαθηταί in a way which disturbs the flow of the narrative (Jesus has been talking to the crowd apparently until 13:34,36) it becomes possible to argue that the independence of the narrative stretches also to independent uses of μαθηταί: Matthew and Luke are representing at that point a particular view of the disciples, a generalizing view as those who seek explanation of Jesus' teaching. Quite different from that approach is a discursive interpretation of ch. 13. This sees 13:52 as a focus for reflection on the nature of Christian understanding, particularly the place of 'what is new and what is old' within it, and how Christian understanding relates to blindness, lack of faith, or little faith. Within that discursive area the patterns of reflection shift from disciples who understand and can be relied upon for teaching, to disciples of whatever standing, for whom what is of critical importance is the relation between understanding and behaviour.

[94] Ignatius, *Ephesians*, 10:1.

Christ in the narratives of chs. 18-20, illustrates the danger of confining study of the discipleship to discipleship vocabulary and conceptuality.

τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν

The Dative is significant, perhaps indicating 'belonging' rather than 'agency'.[95] As we have seen, the Matthean Kingdom of Heaven sayings[96] are a multi-layered, diverse group, in which God's chosen people are assured of his benefits, protection and demands now. To the Kingdom belongs the future judgment, presented with all its traditional associations, but with an emphasis on the present validity of the standards by which all are to be judged. On the one side this is because of the sovereignty of the crucified Son of Man, and on the other it is because of the transcendent sovereignty of God which makes it possible to explore the meaning of human responsibility through its echoes in contemporary morality. The Dative τῇ βασιλείᾳ therefore implies 'commitment' as well as 'belonging', 'responsibility' as well as 'incorporation'.

ὅμοιος

Mt 13 uses ὅμοιος six times, in 13:31-32 Par Lk 13:19,21 and the triplet of parables 13:44,45,47. The other two parabolic uses in Matthew are 11:16 Par Lk 7:32, and 20:1.[97]

ἀνθρώπῳ οἰκοδεσπότῃ

We are dealing here with a narrative formula and a characteristic Matthean Noun.[98] Its New Testament uses include some undefined examples; 10:25

---

[95] See ch.4 p.198 n.86.

[96] What kind of relationship is envisaged between disciples and Kingdom? Is the Participle deponent? These questions affect the functioning of the Dative. The possibilities are numerous: they include 'in, about, to, for, with respect to'.

[97] See Bergemann, *Prüfstand*, 212-213.

[98] The significance of οἰκοδεσπότης in 13:52 can be illustrated both from its biblical and its non-biblical usage (Schenk, *Sprache*, 370).

A. *New Testament*

Mt 7x:

5x No Par

10:25 The Noun expresses a position of responsibility in a household; neither the position nor the responsibility is defined. It is contrasted with οἰκιακός, a term found elsewhere in the NT only at Mt 10:36 Diff Lk, but used in Roman culture (Mason, *Greek Terms*, 70).

13:27 δοῦλοι suggests the landowner's workers at his annual harvest.

13:52 He is possessor of a θησαυρος, a 'treasure chest' (Josephus Ant 9.163) or 'storehouse' (PRyl 231.8). Derrett, *Law*, 15: God brings out valuables from his treasure.

20:1 A vineyard owner with a 'foreman' to call and pay workers.

implies subordination; 13:27 refers to a landowner; 24:43/Lk 12:39 refers to a houseowner. The only narrative non-parabolic use available from the Marcan material is omitted by Matthew. The extra-NT uses are relevant. They range from precise use for persons of social prestige to laudatory uses in inscriptions, metaphorical references to God and extremely general, undefined uses in the fables, in both masculine and feminine forms. It is not found in the LXX although the narrative formula is found (see Esth 2:5).[99] It could well be that ἀνθρώπῳ οἰκοδεσπότῃ is a narrative introduction comparable with that of the fables.

ἐκβάλλει ἐκ τοῦ θησαυροῦ αὐτοῦ

The uses of ἐκβάλλω[100] are all in the general sense of 'cast out', except for 12:20 and 12:35 (2x Diff προφέρει), where 'bring out' is appropriate. In

---

20:1 On who can hear and answer complaints.
1x Diff Mk
21:33 = κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος v40/Mk 12:9/Lk 20:15.
1x Par Lk
24:43 A houseowner carelessly allows his house to be burgled.
Mk 1x:1x Diff Mt 14:14 'Owner'. Mt πρὸς τὸν δεῖνα...
Lk 3x:
1x Par Mk 12:39
1x Par Mt 13:25 See Mt 24:43 above.
2x Diff Mt 13:25 In Luke the one who closes the door when all the guests are assembled.

14:21 (Also Diff Mt) This example does not fit with Jeremias's description of the οἰκοδεσπότης as a nouveau riche tax-collector. He is a nobleman at least, although the social picture is unclear. Matthew has βασιλεύς.

B. *Outside the New Testament*

(i) Of God (in philosophical writings): Philo, *De Somniis* I.149; Epictetus, 3.22.4. (ii) In epitaphs it appears with a laudatory nuance, or with a moral tone: *Papyrus de Philadelphie*, 34. (iii) In fables: *Cor Fab Aesop Dos* II 4.308. In the light of B (ii) and (iii), it seems likely that Rengstorf (*TDNT*, 2.45) is mistaken in regarding the word as used infrequently in everyday life.

[99] We are dealing with a narrative formula for which the LXX is a basis alongside the Hebrew and Aramaic parallels.

[100] ἐκβάλλω (Schenk, *Sprache*, 83-84; Gundry, *Matthew*, 643).
Mt 28x: 6x No Par; 7x Par Mk; 8x Par Lk; 2x Diff Mk; 5x Diff Lk
Mk 16x: 7x Par Mt; 2x Diff Mt; 2x >*Mt; 5 >
Lk 20x: 6x No Par; 8x Par Mt; 5x Par Mk; 1x Diff Mt
With εἰς
Mt 4x: 2x No Par; 1x Par Lk; 1x Diff Mk
Mk 1x: 1x Diff Mt
Lk 1x: 1x Par Mt
With ἐκ
Mt 1x Par Lk; 4x Diff Lk; 1x No Par. Text is doubtful at 7:4: Schenk reads ἀπό.
Mk 1x > Mt
Lk 1x Par Mt

12:20 the most likely translation is 'bring forth justice victoriously',[101] as a complement to the compassionate humility of the Son's revelation of his Father's will. 12:20 may well be an intentional parallel to 12:35. The Son produces 'justice', showing the nature of his resources, as the good man also does. This pivotal use of ἐκβάλλει, together with ἐκ θησαυροῦ, in 12:35 Par Lk 6:45, may point to a similar use in 13:52.

καινὰ καὶ παλαία[102]

The following interpretations of these three words have been offered:

1. *Bornkamm*[103]

True work as a 'scribe' stands between traditionalism on the one side and charismatic freedom on the other. It means, as it meant for the Jewish scribe, respecting tradition but interpreting it for the present. Only understanding (συνιέναι) makes this possible and that is given by God (δέδοται 13:11). It is not the decoding of the parables; it is the direct proclamation of the Kingdom that is at issue.

2. *Dupont*[104]

The Christian scribe teaches not only what is God's revelation accorded through Moses, the prophets and the Fathers, but the Son's introduction of the mysteries of the Kingdom.

3. *Betz*[105]

Mt 13 is a revelation of the hidden meaning of history. The scribe is seen as one who links old and new, who links the salvation-history reviewed in Ps

---

Schenk is misleading on the use of ἐκβάλλω with demons, Satan, spirits:

The figures should read (see also p.199 n.87):

Mt 13x	2x No Par; 4x Par Mk; 1x Diff Mk; 2x Par Lk; 4x Diff Lk
Mk 10x	4x Par Mt; 0x Diff Mt; 2 x >*Mt; 4 x > Mt
Lk 8x	2x Par Mk; 3x No Par; 2x Par Mt

The three parabolic uses 12:35a,35b (Diff Lk προφέρει), 13:52 (No Par) are striking both because of their meaning (= 'produce'), and because of their proximity.

[101] Luz, *Matthäus*, 1/2 246-249, considers favourably a pre-Matthean testimonium stage for the strange text form, and allows for a considerable freedom of reference in several of the quotation's features. Its limits are often hard to define. See also Grindel, *Matthew*; Strecker, *Gerechtigkeit*, 69 n.4; Stanton, *Gospel*, ch. 15; Stendahl, *School*, 114; McConnell, *Law and Prophecy*, 122, also finds the theme of hiddenness insufficient warrant for the length of the quotation, and quotes Mt 11:28 and 28:18-20 as other reference points. See p.192 n.69. As a quotation which points to the ultimate goal of Jesus' ministry, its influence and range of reference cannot be limited by the beginning and end of ch. 12.

[102] Note the order of the words.

[103] Bornkamm, *Lectures*, 1961; Barth, *Gesetzesverständnis*, 149ff.

[104] Dupont, *Nova et Vetera*.

[105] Betz, *Neues et Altes*.

78 and the purpose of God revealed in the Son's word of promise. It is a task, in fact, realized by Matthew in his Gospel.

4. *Walker*[106]

Everything is handled by the Christian 'scribe' in a manner free from care. Confident in the Kingdom the scribe does not need to save anything. On the contrary, he uses everything, what is new and what is old, an attitude which is based on the relationship of judgment and salvation set out in ch. 13. The chapter offers a paradigm of discipleship.

5. *Goulder*[107]

Here is a parabolizing scribe, following a Lord who was himself master of the parable, bringing together new parables and old, as the midrashic method had helped people to do for centuries past.

6. *Zeller*[108]

The individual and the corporate are both found in the Christian scribe's resources, and both have their root in the secrets of the Kingdom, the understanding of which leads to true scribal activity.

7. *Wilkens*[109]

New and old is an inclusive phrase designating the totality of that which has been committed to the disciples.

8. *Cope*[110]

The parables are parallel to Old Testament Scripture in that the plan and will of God are publicly proclaimed in them; and the scribe or disciple trained for the Kingdom knows the eschatological interpretation which will unlock both. Hence old and new refer both to the sources, the OT and the parables, and to the interpretation which will unlock them: they unveil the secret of end-time and of what was hidden from the creation of the world.

9. *Orton*[111]

To bring old and new from a storeroom is more appropriate for a scribe than for a householder (Sir 1:25). It is the privilege of a scribe to receive what is new by divine inspiration, and 13:52 is an example of what is new. It is a newly created saying. Becoming a disciple in relation to the Kingdom involves the privilege of receiving and understanding what is new as well as what is old.

---

106 Walker, *Heilsgeschichte*, 27ff.

107 Goulder, *Midrash*, 375-376.

108 Zeller, *Mt 13,52*.

109 Wilkens, *Redaktion*, 304ff. See Davies, *Matthew*, II 447 n.63, for the translation 'things that are new and yet old'.

110 Cope, *Matthew*, ch. 2.

111 Orton *Scribe*, 137ff.

10. *Luz*[112]

The proclamation of the Risen Christ by those called to be his disciples is the same as that which was proclaimed by Jesus himself (28:20).

The 13:52 saying is cryptic[113] and deserves the description 'symbolic'. It is nevertheless possible to provide a background for its interpretation in terms of 'tradition'.

(iii) *The Tradition*

The Jewish background to this saying is very strong. Wisdom, intertestamental and rabbinic sayings or parables have all been quoted as relevant. It might appear that the saying is so ambiguous as to defy definition. However, the prior context and three major decisions can provide a background. As we have seen, chs. 11-13 provide a context of instruction and reflection. What the 'scribe' must 'produce' takes us into the area of ethics; it includes, for example, justice and wholesome speech,[114] the principles of humanity and concern for others, and the discrimination which follows what is good and avoids lawlessness. But if the parable in 13:52 is to have that range of reference, several of the current interpretations must be based on false assumptions. The distinction between 'new' and 'old' must not involve a 'salvation-history' with a differentiation between old and new which devalues continuity: the distinction must not separate the old and the new, and the new must indicate a positive Christian assessment of the old, especially of the old legal tradition; the distinction must not be simply between 'those who understand' and 'those who do not understand' but between those who are 'committed to the Kingdom' and those who are not.

There are therefore three important areas for discussion:

A. Salvation-history

There is no single approach to Matthean salvation-history. Some scholars regard the chronological and geographical features of Matthew as evidence of a periodizing procedure parallel to that often posited for Luke.[115] The temporal references are however too complex for such a thesis and fall more satisfactorily into overlapping formulae providing a sense of continuity to a narrative.[116] Some regard the disciples and opponents of Jesus in Matthew as transparent to the present, a position which we have already seen requires

---

[112] Luz, *Matthäus*, 1/2 365.

[113] Davies, *Matthew*, II 447-448.

[114] Compare the moral interpretation of 'new and old' in Eliezer's parable of *The Orchard*. See Neusner, *Eliezer*, I 451. Hill, *Matthew*, is correct in that the three-word phrase is symbolic, incorrect if he is suggesting that specific areas of interest in 13:52 cannot be designated.

[115] Thompson, *Divided Community*, 1-25; Kingsbury, *Matthew*, 1-39.

[116] Ogawa, *L'histoire*; see also ch.1 p.13 n.14.

modification and limitation against the background of narrative and discourse studies. Some present the resurrection as a point of reference within a salvation-historical scheme,[117] but while it is a sign of hope for the Gentiles (12:40ff) it links rather than separates the time of Jesus and the time of the church; the authority of the Son of Man makes the time of Jesus a time of revelation and the time of the Kingdom, and this 'time of Jesus' provides the authoritative content for the teaching of the church (25:31ff; 28:20). Other scholars concentrate on the relationship between the era of Israel and the new era,[118] or on the pattern of promise and fulfilment.[119] The sequence of prophets and John the Baptist, mentioned by Matthew in close association with the suffering of Jesus, does not lend itself easily to either viewpoint. Different attitudes to mission provide scholars with a further argument for Matthean periodization; but the mission to the Gentiles is already part of the life of Jesus (4:14-16). Some scholars argue for an analogy, within the Matthean material, between pre- and post-paschal periods based on the theme 'God is with us', but while the theme is secure, the attempt to root the analogy in the text is largely unsuccessful.[120] For the interpretation of 13:52 the crucial point to be drawn from this discussion is the strength of the continuity in Matthew's Gospel between the time of Jesus and the time of the author. The importance of the symbolic phrase is that it is inclusive of the new and the old in that sense.

B. The Law

If the resurrection cannot to be said to be a salvation-historical key to the Gospel, then Meier's attempt to explain the tension between tradition and redaction[121] as a tension between the binding force of the Law as belonging to the pre-Gospel aeon and its prophetic interpretation in the post-death and resurrection aeon (5:18), must be rejected also. Matthew appears to have accepted the Marcan material which upheld the Mosaic Law, and to have weakened Marcan queries about the Law (Mt 15:10ff; 19:1ff; 22:32-37); he retained Jesus' implied claim to authority based on his interpretation of the Law (quoting Hos 6:6), and increased the elements of authority to be shared by Jesus with his followers (9:1-9; 12:1-9).[122] The material which Matthew uses from the Q tradition stresses the continuity of Jesus' summons to righteousness with the message of John the Baptist[123] and the affirmation

---

117 Meier, *Law and History*, 30ff.

118 Fiedler, *Dikaiosyne*, 104ff.

119 Punge, *Endgeschehen*.

120 van Aarde, *God-with-us*.

121 Meier, *Law and History*, 169.

122 I am grateful to Prof. Hooker for her lecture to the British NT Conference on 'Law in Mark', which provides an invaluable basis for this study.

123 Klein, *Frömmigkeit*; Popkes, *Gerechtigkeitstradition*.

of Scripture implied in that righteousness (4:1ff).[124] It contrasts the passing over of justice (what Matthew calls the 'weightier parts of the Law') with insistence on tithing (Mt 23:23/Lk 11:42).[125] This prophetic emphasis is central to Christ's ministry (12:18f) and is the least that could be implied in the phrase 'the Law and the prophets': 'Do not think that I came to abolish the Law and the prophets; I came not to abolish but to fulfil' (5:17).[126] The nature of that fulfilment in Matthew is hard to define: is it a matter of *interpretation* of the Law? The Antitheses (5:31-48) are in some cases an intensified interpretation of the Law; in others they could be regarded as abrogations (5:38-44), but are more probably extensions; they are a 'greater righteousness' in that sense.[127] Or is it a matter of *internalization*, the movement from external obedience to internal motivation, so important in matters of community living (Lev 19:18; Mt 18:15-35)?[128] Or does fulfilment mean its *simplification*, the emphasis on what is essential about the Law, its radical call to commitment to God, which human casuistry can so easily evade in theory or in practice;[129] is fulfilment the bringing of coherence to the Law, bringing together in a summary, ceremonial with moral law, interpretation with the Law's validity? Or does fulfilment mean *completion*? That is implied in 5:18-19; but it is undermined by the absence of references in Matthew to features of the Law such as circumcision.[130] If fulfilment is more than one of these, that can be so because fulfilment is instantiated in the mission and ministry of the Son of God. Matthew's approach to the Law, like that of Mark, did not involve abrogation of the commandments; they were part of the search to know the Father's will. That search would from now on be incomplete without what Jesus said and did. What he said and did involved his going to the cross, his teaching, and the parables which probed the issues of motivation, casuistry, ineffectiveness and hypocrisy. The picture is not uniform, nor do the varieties of attitude in Matthew's sources suggest that uniformity is likely. But the main background for 13:52 is, as in the study of 'salvation-history', once again clear: the background is a continuity of old and new.

---

124 Przybylski, *Righteousness*.
125 Broer, *Gesetz*.
126 Sand, *Gesetz*.
127 Luz, *Matthäus*, I 241, on the 'hinge' function of 5:20.
128 See p.22 n.21.
129 Pamment, *Singleness*.
130 See Mason, *Pharisees*, on the Pharisaic objection to 'newness' in relation to the Law.

C. συνιέναι

How far is it possible to organize the vocabulary of Matthew's Gospel into a theological series of related terms? Barth finds συνιέναι to be a consistent term for the disciples' understanding of the message and mission of Jesus, despite all their shortcomings; he argues that it must have a special significance, since Matthew has a range of other words for understanding and non-understanding. This requires Barth to posit an accidental 'omission' of συνιέναι in Mk 8:17-21. His thesis also fails to suit 16:12 (where 'understand' has a narrower sense), and it fails to suit the other Verbs for 'knowing', whose patterns of use do not suggest deliberate epistemological gradings.[131] The uses of συνίεναι in ch. 13 include, as Barth suggests, a

131 Barth, *Gesetzesverständnis*, 99-108. The question of Matthew's use of Verbs of knowing was raised initially by Barth: Matthew adjusted his sources with respect to the concept of 'understanding' (99), adding συνιέναι in 13:19,23,51, and contrasting the people's blindness with the understanding given to the disciples (13:10,16). Marcan references to the disciples' failure to understand are deleted, or are limited to a temporary failure (see the use of ἀκμὴν in 15:16; the τότε συνῆκαν of 16:12; and the clarification requested in 13:36). Matthew has a range of other words to use for 'knowing'; so his use of συνιέναι is to be explained in terms of Matthean adjustments, with the Christian proclamation as its object and good works as its consequence (13:23). So according to Barth the Matthean πίστις concept is a trusting rather than a knowing (107). The difficulties with Barth's thesis are twofold: his admission that Matthew does not carry through wholly consistently the editorial policy which Barth envisages (the retention of οὐ νοεῖτε in 16:11), and his need to force συνιέναι into the mould of significant Christian understanding when a different content is given to it by the Matthean context (συνῆκαν in 16:10 is followed by ὅτι οὐκ εἶπεν προσέχειν). Schenk, *Sprache*, 138, agrees with Kretzer, Conzelmann and Strecker that this is a special term for Christian understanding, with ethical connotations, and gives γινώσκω in 13:11 and μαθητευθείς in 13:52 as synonyms. This attempt to use linguistic items to track conceptual shifts requires a securer base: Schenk gives only the summary figures for the use of these related linguistic items, discussing in detail only the Matthean features. When the same kind of detailed discussion is applied to the other Synoptists a less secure picture emerges. For example, Schenk quotes γινώσκω as an absolute synonym for συνίημι without commenting that the same Verb in the same form (γνῶναι) appears at the same point in Matthew and in Luke (Mt 13:11/Lk 8:10), among a sequence of agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark. The summary figures for related Verbs found in the Synoptists are:

γινώσκω

Mt 20x:	5x No Par; 3x Par Mk; 4x Par Lk; 4x Diff Mk; 4x Diff Lk
Mk 12x:	3x Par Mt; 1x Diff Mt; 1x > Mt; 6 > ; 1 Text ?
Lk 25x:	15x No Par; 3x Par Mk; 4x Par Mt; 2x Diff Mk, 1x Diff Mt

ἐπιγινώσκω

Mt 6x:	2x No Par; 1x Par Mk; 1x Diff Mk; 2x Diff Lk
Mk 4x:	1x Par Mt; 1x Diff Mt; 2 x >
Lk 7x:	6x No Par; 1x Par Mk

strong element of moral commitment. But a survey of ἐντέλλομαι, διαστέλλομαι ἐπιτρέπω, διδάσκω, μαθητεύω and λαλέω suggests that 4:23, 9:35 and 11:1 are types of summary material and not specifically related to categories within the ministry of Jesus. συνιέναι is best defined by its contexts: 13:19 and 15:10 both belong to a post-Marcan tradition where it is critical of human failure to understand the dangers posed by the devil and by Pharisaic tradition; the hearer is rendered slow to grasp the mysteries of the Son's revelation. 13:51f takes this further, suggesting that 'understanding' involves a grasp of those mysteries, of how God's work in the Law is related to the Son's revelation; it involves a grasp of God's eternal purpose, as well as of his work through Jesus Christ. Orton claims

---

οἶδα

Mt 25x: 5x No Par; 10x Par Mk; 5x Par Lk; 5x Diff Mk
Mk 22x: 10x Par Mt; 1x Diff Mt; 1x >*; 4x > Mt; 6x >
Lk 24x: 10x No Par; 7x Par Mk; 5x Par Mt; 1x Diff Mk; 1x Diff Mt

There are several cases where the argumentation used by Schenk does not fit Matthew's flexibility. He argues that ἐπιγινώσκω refers to 'knowledge of true identity', suggesting that this is one reason why Matthew uses the compound Verb in Mt 11:27 Diff Lk 10:22. He argues that Matthew does not use γινώσκω with God as subject. Neither do Mark and Luke at 16:15 and 10:22. More important is the double appearance of *The Good Trees and Good Fruit* logion in Matthew, which appears once with γινώσκω 2x and once with ἐπιγινώσκω 2x. It is true, as Prof. Coppens used to argue, that ἐπι- can be intensive. But it need not be, and the Simple Verb can have an intensive sense without the Preposition. The classification of ἐπιγινώσκω as intensive in the sense of 'knowledge of true identity' in any case is being used by Schenk and Guthrie as a cover for the 'recognition' uses of ἐπιγινώσκω, e.g. Mt 14:35 ἐπιγνόντες=Mk 6:54. Schenk refers to γνοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς as Matthean editorial, but does not refer to the parallel in Mk and Lk ἐπιγνοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, thus short-circuiting the argument. Formulae and editorial preferences are two different categories for classifying linguistic usage, and the γνοὺς/ἐπιγνούς uses could belong to the former. The interrelations of γινώσκω and οἶδα are also interesting: Mt 27:18 ᾔδει Diff Mk ἐγίνωσκεν; Mk 12:15 εἰδώς Diff Mt γνοὺς; Lk 12:56 οἴδατε Diff Mt γινώσκετε. Matthew has εἰδὼς(B) τὰς ἐνθυμήσεις 9:4 Diff Mk ἐπιγνούς (in a context where the intensive use should have been to Matthew's liking, but where 9:4 seems to have been affected by Mt 12:25 Par Lk. For the reverse, see Mk 12:15 Diff Mt 22:18 γνοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς). The dangers when editorial changes to linguistic items are forced into theological conceptual patterns should be fully recognized. There are the two dangers: that usage may be more fluid than at first sight appears, especially where traditional formulae and traditions are in use; and, second, that the hypothesis of conceptual change has to be refined more and more in an increasingly strained effort to fit the facts. That is not to say that συνιέναι is not a significant item of vocabulary. As Orton has suggested (*Scribe*, 145), there is the use of συνέσις in Sirach to be explored; and at the spring of the Matthean uses (Mt 13:13) is Mk 4:12 with its version of Isa 6:9f. But 'understanding' is basic to a series of Matthean expressions (γνῶναι, βλέπειν, ἀκούειν, ἀσύνετος, νοεῖν, ἐπιγινώσκειν). See Schenk, *Sprache*, 135-139.

that this is the sense of συνιέναι in Sirach (see also Dan 12:8a). The Lord's question 'συνήκατε;' (13:51) involves the elements already discussed under the headings of 'Salvation-history' and 'Law', and Barth's emphasis on 'understanding' as involving moral commitment. 13:52 includes all those elements, but it also stresses the continuity of what God has done and what God is doing. It represents the eternal, unchanging authority of the God who is always with us and the authority of the suffering Son of Man and the Son of Man in glory. To grasp this, as 13:52 hints darkly, is the essence of scribal work and of discipleship. It is a result of using the available traditions, old and new.

(iv–v) *The History of the Parables and the History of Redaction*
13:52 is a cryptic Wisdom parable, a kind of riddle, ending with an evocative phrase: it is rich in historical and contemporary resonances, challenging the hearer by raising issues of authority and tradition. Its main Verb has strong ethical associations (12:35). It is a summary parable in the sense that the various strands of material in 11:1–13:51, especially 12:18-21 and 12:35, and in 13:1-51, can be recognized as coherent in the parable's final three words. καινὰ καὶ παλαιά are wrestled with as word symbols, operating in a context where discipleship can be seen as a response to the divine will; that divine will has been known from ancient times, and is known now, through the Son's revelation, in its fresh challenge and promise.

C. *The Unforgiving Servant* Mt 18:23-35

(i) *The Context*
The context of *The Unforgiving Servant* provides a number of important clues to the parable's subsequent history. Matthew follows the course of Mark's Gospel from 13:53 (except for the pericope on the *Blind Man of Bethsaida* Mk 8:22-26). This pattern continues as far as 17:22. Some[132] regard 17:22 as a structural break, designated so by chronological and geographical terms. We have found that this approach to Matthew's editorial work through chronological terms is unsatisfactory in other contexts; that is the case here also.[133] The formation of the so-called 'Community

[132] Murphy-O'Connor, *Structure*, 360ff; and in reply Gooding, *Structure*; see also Thompson, *Divided Community*.

[133] On 18:1, see p.13 n.14. On 17:22, see Appendix No. 23. Thompson's case for a logical continuity between 7:22ff and 18:1ff is partly based on ἄρα in 18:1: 'Neither the particle itself nor the combination τίς ἄρα/τί ἄρα is characteristic. But when Matthew uses the interrogative phrases the question always emerges from the preceding context. The disciples' question (19:35)

---

expresses astonishment at Jesus' previous remarks (19: 23-24). Similarly Peter's question (19:27) flows easily from his own previous statement.... In each case the illative particle ἄρα expresses a logical and coherent connection between the question and the previous context' (*Divided Community*, 7). Doubt regarding Thompson's argument rests on four grounds (pace Schenk, *Sprache*, 381; Gundry, *Matthew*, 642):

(i) ἄρα is capable of at least ten possible nuances.

1. Inferential:

a. 2 Cor 7:12 'So then you see'; Jos Ant 19.210 'It seems' (slightly weaker).

b. Jos War 3.358 'It is clear' (often with an exclamation).

c. 1 Cor 5:10 'in that case' (a specialized use particularly in Paul).

2. Exclamatory: Jos War 4.175 'then' with a rhetorical question; Job 23:3 LXX.

This does not appear in the non-literary Papyri; see Horn, *Papyri*.

3. Introductory: This is a particular favourite of Codex Bezae: Lk 24:1 'Tell me'. See Acts 5:6; 7:1. Untranslated often: Euripides, *Hippolytus* 76. Marking the antecedent: Homer, *Iliad* 2.761.

4. Explanatory: Jos Ant 19.4 'As you may know'.

5. To disclose an attitude (anxiety, scorn, surprise): Jos Ant 18.271; 17.352.

6. Epexegetic: Jos War 7.357 'Namely'.

7. Cautionary: Acts 17:21 'Perhaps'.

8. Narrative: Jos War 6.249 Parenthetic: 'However'; Jos War 2.186 Sequential: 'As the sequel showed'. Homer, *Iliad*, passim 'Straight away' (with catalogues).

9. Avowed Intention: Jos War 2.591.

10. Intensive: Jos Ant 9.168.

Some of the Josephus usages could be anachronistic.

(ii) The NT uses

The figures refer to the classification and descriptions given under (i) above.

Mt 7x:	1x Diff Lk	7:20	A case of 1a Inferential with γὲ. See p.26.
	2x Par Lk	12:28	Par Lk 11:20.
			An LXX conditional use: 'then actually'.
		24:45	Par Lk 12:42. Probably 3 Introductory.
			Many parables have this opening but without ἄρα.
			The connection with 24:42-44 makes 1c possible
			(Lambrecht, *Parousia*, 313) but the participles do not
			create the thematic unity often claimed for ch. 24.
	3x Diff Mk	18:1	could be 3, 8a or 1.
		19:25	1c 'In that case'.
		19:27	could be 2a, 3, 5, or 8.
			Style, content and direction of thought suggest 3.
	1x No Par	17:26	1a 'Then you see'.
Mk 2x :	1x Diff Mt	4:41	2a. See also Lk 8:25.
			Matthew uses an exclamatory ποταπός;
	1x >*Mt	11:21	Probably 7.
Lk 6x:	2x No Par	1:66	2 rather than 8?
		22:23	7?
	1x Par Mk	8:25	2a. See Mk 4:41 above.

Discourse' in Mt 18 is a result of following Mark (although possibly not Mark in the form in which we know it)[134] to a point where Mark and Q

	2x Par Mt	11:20 See above.
		12:42 See above.
	1x Diff Mt	11:48 1. See Thrall, *Particles*, 36.
Acts		8:21 7.
		11:11 1.
		12:18 2.
		17:27 7.
		21:38 5.

Most of the remainder (26x) are 1, except 2 Cor 1:17 (5) and 1 Cor 15:14 (8?).

(iii) The Gospel parallels and versions

18:1 is not to be found in Mk 9:34 or Lk 9:46 or Mt 23:11, and probably the Thomas parallel is independent: 'The disciples said to Jesus: We know that you will go away from us. Who is it who shall be chief over us?' (GThom Logion 12). In Logion 12 (II,34,25) ⲉⲧⲛⲁ$\overline{ⲣ}$ and its context support the reading of other versions that a Future reference is appropriate (see Mt 20:21). But even given a Future reference, in 18:1 the force of the Particle (not present in Logion 12) is unclear. The MS evidence illustrates how easily Particles interchange in the tradition (Mt 7:20; 12:28; 24:45). None of the versions uses a clearly illative translation.

(iv) The argument of 17:22 ff.

The argument for an illative sense (Thompson, *Divided Community*, 94-99) runs: (A) There is a correspondence between the instructions which follow each of the Passion predictions; (B) in the case of the second Passion prediction the dialogue leads from a discussion about freedom to the question of the criteria of greatness in the Kingdom.

On (A) it is not clear that there is a correspondence between 17:22ff and the example of the second Passion Narrative;

On (B) it is not clear that the subject of 'freedom' necessarily leads to the question of 'greatness'.

A better solution is to employ the theory of dependence on Mark, to assume that Matthew, when he recorded Mk 9:30-40, also recalled Mk 10:42-43 with its reference to royal power (see Mt 17:25). The Marcan associations provide the connections of thought between 17:22 and 18:1ff. There is no need then for the assumption of a subterranean logic behind 18:1.

Conclusion on the meaning of ἄρα in 18:1: Category 1 is possible; Category 8a is least likely; Category 3 may well be correct.

[134] See p.29 n.34. The Minor Agreement with Luke against Mark requires explanation. A possible explanation is that the Marcan tradition was seen to be offering two answers to the opening question in 9:34: in 9:35 and in 9:36-37. Lk 9:48 emerged in recognition of that fact, summing up the answer with the demonstrative οὗτος. 9:36-37 was seen to be offering a more fundamental and inclusive reply, going beyond that of mutual service. The reversal of values implied in Mk 9:36-37 (the smallest becomes the greatest) is reflected in Lk 9:48abc with its particle ἄρα. The summing up of the answer is accompanied by the sharpening of the question itself. Matthew's knowledge of the Marcan tradition could have been affected by similar stages of clarification, whether or

materials overlap (18:6/Mk 9:42 and Lk 17:1-2). From this point the Q material becomes decisive; it shapes the remainder of the discourse. There are two particular focus points: 'stumbling-blocks'[135] and 'the brother who

---

not in this case the actual Lucan response was known to him. Matthew's version is the clearest statement both of the question and of an initial answer.

135 See p.18.

σκάνδαλον

Mt 5x: 1x Diff Mk; 2x No Par; 1x Par Lk; 1x Diff Lk
Lk 1x: 1x Par Mt
Rest of NT 9x

σκανδαλίζω

Mt 14x: 5x No Par; 7x Par Mk; 1x Diff Mk; 1x Par Lk
Mk 8x: 7x Par Mt; 1x >
Lk 2x: 1x Par Mk
1x Par Mt
Rest of NT 6x

Schenk, *Sprache*, 429-431 (and see Gundry, *Matthew*, 649), concentrates on the noetic aspect of the Matthean uses, in harmony with Barth, *Gesetzesverständnis*. His case for this rests on four grounds:

(i) The influence of the few LXX uses of the Verb; the absence of the Verb (except Ps Sol 16:7) from Hellenistic Jewish usage.

(ii) The use of the Noun links up with the Matthean attitude to ἀνομία, and the false teachers of the Law who oppose him: 13:41; 18:7. See also Satan and temptation in 16:23.

(iii) The editorial usage of σκανδαλίζομαι ἐν: Mt 4x (2x Diff Mk).

(iv) The NT usage of the verb is related to Jesus' words and has a noetic element. 'Die Bedeutung ist immer: sich unverständig von Jesus abwenden.'

These grounds are unsatisfactory:

(i) The LXX evidence is influential: see the uses of the Verb regarding moral standards and attitudes in Sirach. This emphasis is closely linked with idolatry: e.g. 1 Cor 8; that is particularly true of the Noun σκάνδαλον: Wis 14:11, Ps 140(141):9 (see below). The Hebrew Nouns מוקש מכמר create a rich field of reference in the OT and Qumran (see CD 22; also Aramaic equivalents in the Targumim). In Aquila and Symmachus (see *Aquila Index*, 216), in which acting, speaking, thinking sinfully are part of the people's downfall (see, e.g., Aquila on Ez 14:1-5, translating מכשל and used with ἀνομία in Ez 7:19), and this is registered by using the Greek σκανδαλ-root. A good example linking several important word fields with σκάνδαλον, including βδέλυγμα (see שקץ), πορνεία, and sacrifice to δαιμόνια, is Ps 104(105):32-42. These uses interlock with the πλανάω, ἀπατάω, προσκόπτω, βλασφημέω word fields in Sirach, the Testament of the XII Patriarchs, the NT, Didache and Barnabas. In the light of this, it is most unwise to limit σκάνδαλον, and probably σκανδαλίζω, to so tight a range of reference (see Lövestam, *Blasphemia*). σκάνδαλον could refer to idolatrous or blasphemous acts or speech, moral offences against humanity and God, especially false attitudes to women and to money, lack of consideration shown by the strong to the weak, betrayal or denial of Christ, and false belief, idolatry, immorality, false prophecy, demonic traps, seen in relation to or as part of the last days.

sins'; the first becomes the focus for the remainder of the first half of the 'Community Discourse'; the second provides the focus for 18:15ff: 'The brother who sins' is to be 'rebuked'[136] and (if he repents) 'forgiven' (Lk 17:3f).

The second half of the chapter, Mt 18:15ff, includes, as we have already seen, traditional material.[137] The subject of 'the brother who sins' was extended through reference to a threefold disciplinary system, and the subject of the 'forgiving of a brother' was extended by means of the conversation with Peter (18:21f), followed by the parable of *The Unforgiving Servant.* The form of 18:15f is pre-Matthean and Greek,[138] and vv15-17 betray an approach to community discipline based on Lev 19:17.[139] 18:18 emphasizes

---

(ii) According to Davison, in *Anomia*, Barth's assumption of antinomian opponents behind the uses of σκάνδαλον and ἀνομία is unreliable. In the LXX and intertestamental literature ἀνομία is an appropriate Noun to be applied to Gentiles; it is employed for conduct opposed to the Law of God of all kinds, but never for violation of the Law in principle. Of the Matthean uses, 7:21-23 suggests that outwardly there is nothing to set one particular group off from the rest; outwardly all look like sheep; 13:41 has a non-specific sense, unless it implies a failure to live up to the commandment to love God and one's neighbour, as ἀνομία fails to do in 24:10-12; 23:28 cannot refer to antinomians, as it is about Pharisees. So the OT phrase in 13:41 πάντα τὰ σκάνδαλα καὶ τοὺς ποιοῦντας τὴν ἀνομίαν (Ps 140(141):9) concerns all who exhibit a lack of genuine seriousness about their moral life.

(iii) Two of the four uses of σκανδαλίζομαι ἐν are from source material. The other two come from a single unit: 26:31-33. The issue is whether this can only be understood to mean 'fail to understand and abandon me' or whether it could be mean 'lose your faith in me'. Schenk's argument, following Barth, is that πιστεύω does not function in Matthew as a main category. This can be debated on linguistic grounds (see 18:6); but, more important, the concept of discipleship, as we have argued, concerns more than understanding. Understanding is only part of the commitment: see Mt 28:18-20. Baptism registers a complementary level of commitment and participation. Did the original reader hear that in 18:6?

(iv) The uses of the Verb do not lend themselves to a simple categorization. 11:6 Par Lk 7:23 could, from the context, be taken to mean 'does not take offence at what I do' (see 11:19) or 'does not take offence at who I am' (see the messianic proclamation implicit in 11:5; see 4Q513) or 'is led into the sin of refusing to believe in me' (by failing to see that the precursor has come). Any of these would fit the context, and if the noetic pattern which Barth prefers as the primary 'faith category' can no longer be clearly sustained for Matthew, then 11:6 can be taken in its contextual senses. Similarly, 5:29-30 can be taken to mean 'if your hand causes you to offend against the divine law in its new radical interpretation' and 18:8-9 can imply 'if your hand makes you sin by causing havoc among his little ones' (see 18:14).

136 See p.22.

137 See pp.23-25.

138 See pp.19-22.

139 See p.22 n.21.

the authority of the church to give or withhold forgiveness,[140] and v18, together with the two logia which follow, appears to belong to a pre-Matthean unit.[141]

All of these features of Mt 18 are clues to the history of the conversation with Peter and of the summary parable; but to understand this requires an examination of the text of Mt 18:23-35 and its redaction.

(ii) *The Redaction*

The most important characteristic of the parable of *The Unforgiving Servant*

---

[140] There are eight possible interpretations of 'binding' and 'loosing':
1) To declare forbidden by ritual law or to permit. Basser, *Binding*, 299, regards the evidence for this as fairly late. But Chilton, *Promise to Peter*, asks if the Isaiah Targum 22:22 might be regarded as early evidence for a mechanism to articulate a cultic halakah (see Rev 3:7; also Davies, *Matthew*, II 638). 2) To excommunicate or to give absolution/to lift the ban; Green, *Matthew*; Thompson, *Divided Community*, 192 (quoting the Palestinian Targum on Num 30:6,9,13). 3) To apply or not to apply existing penalties, to release from or refuse to release from oaths; Derrett, *Law*, 351 n.1; Hill, *Matthew*. 4) To withhold or give forgiveness. See John 20:33; Neofiti Targum Gen 4:7; Emerton, *Binding*. 5) To have total authority; Lambert, *Contraires*. 6) To remit or retain sin; Palestinian Targum on Gen 4:7. 7) To bind and loose; of the exorcism of demonic powers or the tightening or loosing of the bonds of death (see p.22 n.21). 8) To determine a person's final destiny; Falk, *Binding*, 92-100.
In addition to these there are various other important areas of research:
(i) The relation of 16:19 to 18:18: some features of this relationship were relevant to p.23. There is the possibility that 'binding' and 'loosing' in 16:19 is balanced by the emphasis on forgiveness in ch. 18, or indeed drawn by 18:18-20 into a pattern of Christological mediation 'from above' and ecclesiological mediation 'from below'. On the relation of heaven and earth in Matthew, see Syreeni, *Symbolic Universe*.
(ii) The significance of the Periphrastic tense: Carson, *Matthew*, 370-371, argues for the translation 'shall have been bound/loosed' and relates it to Peter's proclamation of the Gospel; the disciples bind and loose on earth through the Gospel proclamation what has, with the coming of the Kingdom, been bound and loosed in heaven. A more appropriate background is provided by the prophetic context described on p.94.
(iii) The significance of the 'rock' and the 'Gates of Hades': the powers of death (Hommel, *Tore*) and chaos have been broken, and security established for those who confess Christ and are incorporated into the ἐκκλησία.
Of the above possibilities, 3), 4) and 6) have the strongest claim within the final redaction of ch. 18: 1) could well have figured in earlier stages of the tradition. The strength of 4) rests in the relationship between 16:19 and 18:18.

[141] See Beyer, *Syntax*, 191.

is that it has a threefold outline.[142] It falls into three scenes,[143] with an introduction and conclusion. The first two scenes are told in a distinctive style, the main components of which are similar sentence or unit lengths[144] and folk-story techniques of narration with emotional appeal[145] and economy of language,[146] with simplicity and clarity preferred to realism. In these scenes not only are the more characteristic signs of redaction missing; signs of a pre-Matthean source are present.[147] The main parallels to the language of these scenes are the fables, the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs and Josephus.[148] It is not until 18:30 that parallels with other sections of Matthew's Gospel begin to appear with any strength.[149]

The language of the first two scenes integrates perfectly with the style of the narration. Language common to this parable and the fables supports the folk-story character of the parable. The vocabulary, shared also with the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, opens up emotional and reflective

---

142 Triple forms are common in Matthew; see *The Two Houses*, with its triple division in each of the two halves. The outline here is traced in three scenes: see Breukelman, *Schalksknecht*.

143 Introduction (v23): Section I vv24-27; Section II vv28-30; Section III vv31-34; Conclusion v35.

144 vv24, 26, 27, 29 are of roughly the same length or are composed of units of the same length, measured by the number of syllables:

v24:	10 (Gen Abs)	:6:10:
v25:	11 (Gen Abs)	:13:15 + 6;
v26:	14 (Gen Abs)	:8:8;
v27:	14	:6:10;
v28:	10:10:13	:6:5:8;
v29:	9	:8:8:6.

If account is taken of MS variations, the impression of similarity is strengthened rather than weakened.

145 σπλαγχνίζομαι, μακροθυμέω, πνίγω, λυπέω, ὀργίζομαι.

146 The language, vocabulary and style are that of a folk-story. Pace Derrett, there is no insistence on complete realism. No apology is offered for its simplifications, and, in the first two sections, the story has a blend of brevity and clarity. For a detailed discussion of the first two scenes see Jones, *Matthew 18*, 68-248.

147 e.g. the narrative οὖν vv26 and 31; see p.339 n.221.

148 The fables: e.g. the rare Imperfect ἔπνιγεν in v28: see Babrius, 27. The Testament of the XII, especially σπλαγχνίζομαι, μακροθυμέω. Josephus: τὰ γ(ι)νόμενα, ἀπολύω, δανεῖον ἀφῆκεν (the general use of δανεῖον for 'debt' in Josephus is to be noted, pace Lambrecht, *Treasure*, 57, De Boer, *Unforgiving Servant*).

149 Pace Reiser, *Gericht*, 265-266.

18:30,32,34	: Mt 5:25f;
18:31	: Mt 18:10; 27:54;
18:32	: Mt 25:26;
18:33,35	: Mt 6:12-15.

elements in the narrative, and parallels with Josephus are features of a clear, flowing story.

At one point in the narrative a parallel with a Lucan parable appears (compare Mt 18:25 and Lk 7:42).[150] Both parallels have in common a contrast between a larger remission of debt and a smaller, and an expectation of corresponding gratitude.[151] They have in common a vocabulary at least as extensive as some Q parables exhibit.[152] To suggest a coincidence of vocabulary and subject matter hardly meets the singularity of the expressions they have in common. It is possible that the Early Church or the teaching of Jesus used the subject of 'an inability to repay a debt' in different contexts. But it would seem best to assume that behind the agreement of Mt 18:25 and Lk 7:41 there are related traditions, and that it offers a glimpse of the pre-history of this parable.

Although there is evidence of a pre-history to the parable this cannot be traced to a Semitic stage.[153] The syntax is Hellenistic in character,[154] without any exceptions. That does not mean that it cannot be translated back into Hebrew or Aramaic; there are similarities of narrative style between fables in all three languages. Nevertheless the syntax is Hellenistic and the story shows every sign of having been told in Greek terms. On the other hand there is little evidence of an earlier story being subjected throughout to theological over-writing.[155] The examples which have often been given of theological terminology in this parable are capable of satisfactory alternative explanations, although theological connotations cannot be excluded.

Structuralist analysis of the parable has been singularly successful[156] because of the dramatic staging within the parable,[157] especially where, as in Dan Via's early period, the literary analysis of dramatic roles was linked

---

150 Some features common to the language of Mt 18:25 and Lk 7:41 are distinctive within synoptic usage: e.g. μὴ ἔχοντος ἀποδοῦναι. Contrast this with the synoptic usage of ἔχω as a whole.

151 Lk 7:41 δηνάρια πεντακόσια: Mt 18:24 μυρίων ταλάντων. Lk 7:41 πεντακόσια: ἑκατὸν δηνάρια Mt 18:28. Lk 7:41 and Mt 18:32.

152 In Luke 7:41,2,9 there are 9 words common with Matthew out of 32 words.

153 Examples quoted of Semitic usage include εἷς meaning 'a', 'a certain' v24; this is however not Semitic: see Turner, *Grammar*, 195-196. Matthew belongs to a literary context where this usage is possible: see Jos Ant 3.235 and, in postposition, Jos War 1.579. See also ch.5 p.353 n.287.

154 e.g. the structural use of the Genitive Absolute, as in the fables; also εἴ τι ὀφείλεις (18:28) as in the LXX (pace Davies, *Matthew*, II 801).

155 παρεκάλει 18:29 and προσεκύνει 18:26 are significant terms of secular obeisance: see Jos Ant 7.362. Dietzfelbinger, *Schuld*, 442ff, points to the motif of 'granted time' vv26-27,32-33. See Erlemann, *Gottesbild*, 56.

156 Scott, *Parable*, ch. 12.

157 Crossan, *Servant*, 17-62, 192-221.

to an existentialist interpretation of the parable's emotional features.[158] It is necessary to hear the parable against the pattern of Master–Servant parables, so that distinctive features of the parable are heard against the hearers' expectations, and we can follow the hearers' reactions as those expectations are successively fulfilled or challenged.[159]

It is at this point that the main problem posed by this parable has to be faced. Only structuralist analysis which represses all historical questions can afford to neglect it. It sets question marks, for example, against the positions expressed by Via in the middle period of his parabolic research.[160] The problem is this: the third scene is different from the first two in style, sentence length, vocabulary and level of interplay with the remainder of Matthew's Gospel. This has been noted in part by a number of scholars,[161] and seen by them as raising traditio-historical and redactional issues. The form shifts from epic to extended epic, and with that shift the code changes too.

Since the problem begins in v30 our analysis commences there also:

v30 ἔβαλεν αὐτὸν εἰς φυλακήν
At this point the pattern of balancing phrases and sentences in threefold divisions is broken, and a parallel to Mt 5:26 is introduced, all the more interesting because the contexts in ch. 5 and ch. 18 imply different legal procedures.[162]

v31 With the repetition of the Participle γ(ε)νομενα, the story departs from its succinctness; and, if textually correct,[163] the change from a Present to an

---

158 Via, *Parables*, 142ff.
159 Scott, *Parable*, 270.
160 Via, *Kerygma*.
161 Weder, *Gleichnisse*, 210-212.
162 In the former (see Jeremias, *Parables*, 180), two stages precede the imprisonment of the offender, in the latter none. According to Derrett, *Unmerciful Servant*, 40 n.2, the powers of the one to whom the debt is owed are different in the two passages.
163 Senior, *Passion*, 325, assumes that γινόμενα should be read at 18:31: 'Also of interest for the formulation of 27:54 is the use of the participle in 18:3 (M) where γινόμενα has some of the summary function which it has in 27:54.' The following observations are relevant:
1) In 18:31(1) and 18:31(2) the evidence for γινόμενα is mainly the cursives, as the evidence for γενόμενα is in Mark 13:29.
2) In 18:31 and 27:54 there are similarities of phrase. This could be either an argument for both being Matthean or an argument for the text of one being influenced by the other.
3) The MS evidence is unequally divided among the γενόμενα/γινόμενα readings: in 18:31(1) and 18:31(2) the case for γενόμενα is strong; in 27:54 the evidence

Aorist Participle would be out of keeping with the straightforwardness of the narrative hitherto. The influence of Mt 27:54 is also possible. The remainder of the verse may have other connections with the Matthean context of the parable, particularly with 18:10. ἐλυπήθησαν σφόδρα expresses emotion, as in 26:22 and 17:23.[164] This is in keeping with the earlier stages of the story, but the expression used here has parallels with the remainder of Matthew.

v32 τότε marks a critical moment in the parable; but accompanied by λέγει + Dative it raises the possibility of Matthean redaction here.[165] προσκαλεσάμενος is not characteristic of Matthew but as an extremely useful situation-setter may have slipped naturally into both 18:2 and 18:32.[166]

---

is more balanced; in Mk 13:29 (Par Lk; Mt >*) the evidence for γινόμενα is strongest.

4) A few MSS in both 18:31(1) and 27:54 read γινόμενα (e.g. D 983.1689) and some have that reading in 28:11 and 27:54 (47.258). This could be an argument for treating their evidence as unreliable in one text or in both.

5) In 18:31(1) and 27:54 it could be argued that γινόμενα is the harder reading. In 18:31(2) and 28:11 it could be argued that γινόμενα is so hard a reading as to be unlikely, since a reference to reporting crucial events would seem in both cases to imply past events.

6) The double use of γ(ι)νομενα in 18:31 is strange. Thompson speaks of it as emphatic. But it is unwieldy and out of keeping with the succinct language in the earlier part of the parable. It is possible that the narrative in 27:54 influenced the text at 18:31.

[164] On the question of which particular emotion, see Manson, *Sayings*, 214; for different nuances for this phrase in the same book, see 1 Macc 10:68 and 14:16. Perhaps the sense here is similar to the English 'extremely upset'.

[165] τότε + λέγει

Mt 22x:	No Par	6x (25:34,37,41,44,45; 28:10*).
	Par Mk	-
	Diff Mk	11x (4:17; 9:6*; 12:23*; 15:28; 16:24; 19:27; 22:21*; 26:31,38*,52*; 27:13).
	Par Lk	-
	Diff Lk	5x (4:10*Diff Lk 4:8 καί; 9:37*Diff Lk 10:2 δέ; 12:44*; 22:8*,13).
Mk 0x:		
Lk 3x:	No Par	2x (13:26; 23:30).
	Diff Mk	-
	Diff Mt	1x (14:21)

Those marked with an asterisk have also an accompanying Dative (Mt 1x No Par; 7x Diff Mk; 3x Diff Lk), those of 12:44 and 22:8 appear in parables. In 18:32 the participial phrase intervenes as it has intervened throughout the parable between the verse opening and the main Verb.

[166] προσκαλεσάμενος Matthew uses the Aorist Participle Middle in six places, and the Verb nowhere else.

The Pronouns αὐτοῦ/αὐτόν In contrast with the earlier verses (in so far as the MSS allow a definitive judgment on this) the repetition of Personal

---

1) 10:1	Par Mk	Mk 6:7 προσκαλεῖται. Lk 9:1 συγκαλεσάμενος; Acts 10:24. συγκαλέω is found only at Mk 15:16, and in Luke/Acts 7x. Mt 10:1 has several agreements with Lk 9:1, Diff Mk 6:7, and links with Lk 6:13, Mk 3:13f, 6:6f.
2) 15:10	Par Mk	Mk 7:14 καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος πάλιν i.e. in Mark, Jesus takes a further initiative. A more generalized context is implied in Matthew.
3) 15:32	Par Mk	Mk 8:1 Mark's double Genitive Absolute is absent in Matthew, who again uses a generalized introduction.
4) 18:2	Diff Mk	Mk 9:36 λαβών. Lk 9:47 ἐπιλαβόμενος.

The full statistics of these Verbs yield the following conclusions: Matthew could have altered the Marcan λαβών in order to use a less ambiguous word; Luke could have altered Mark for a favourite expression. Perhaps 18:32 influenced the choice of προσκαλεσάμενος in 18:2.

5) 18:32	No Par	Of an angry summons to the royal presence.
6) 20:25	Par Mk	Of Jesus' response to disciples.

Mark's uses are:

1) 3:13	Par Mt	
2) 3:23	Diff Mt	Mt and Lk read εἰδὼς, Mk προσκαλεσάμενος, meaning 'he called them forward'.
3) 6:7	Par Mt	
4) 7:14	Par Mt	
5) 8:1	Par Mt	
6) 8:34	>*Mt	Mt and Lk both omit προσκαλεσάμενος.
7) 10:42	Par Mt	Luke omits the phrase.
8) 12:43	>	
9) 15:44	>Mt	

Luke's uses are:

1) 7:18	Diff Mt	Lk προσκαλεσάμενος δύο τινὰς. Mt begins with John as subject and records that John sent disciples to Jesus.
2) 15:26	No Par	Parable (see 16:5 also).
3) 16:5	No Par	Formal summons or informal arrangement.
4) 18:16	Diff Mk	Lk προσεκαλέσατο.

Acts προσκαλεσάμενοι
5:40 'had brought them in'.
6:2 a very wide possible range of sense.
23:17 'call over' or 'send for'.
23:23 'sent for'.

James 5:14.

The LXX:
προσκαλεσάμενος Gen 28:1; Wis 18:8; 2 Macc 7:25; 3 Macc 5:1,18,37; 6:30.
The Papyri: PAmh II 35.22 (132 BCE); PFay 12.29 (103 BCE).
These details cast doubt on Thompson's judgment (*Divided Community*, 76 n.24). They suggest that it is pre-Matthean. See Kee, *Community*, 43.

Pronoun (other than for clarity) and the length of sentence are both noteworthy. They indicate that the style is changing.
πονηρέ This Adjective, also found in Mt 25:26 and Lk 19:22 (i.e. a Q passage), is difficult to evaluate in Matthew. It could have, but need not have, a strongly theological reference.[167]
ὀφειλὴν ἀφῆκε is a first hint of alliteration in the parable. The Adjectives πᾶσαν and ἐκείνην are found together only here and in Mt 25:7 within the New Testament.[168]
ἐπεί is unique in the Synoptics in the sense 'because', except for Mt 21:46 Diff Mk (see also Jn 19:31), which has a number of possibly redactional features.

v33 The form of this sentence, in terms of the parable as a whole and of the surrounding verses, is unusual.
δεῖ The closest parallel to this is 25:27, just as the closest parallel to 18:32 is 25:26.[169] In both contexts this Verb takes up the description of a servant's mistake.
ἐλεῆσαι The choice of word here is unexpected. The reason for its use could be 'as an adjunct by secondary association'.[170] συ, σου, σε continue the proliferation of Pronouns. ὡς could be a causal use, parallel only to 6:12 in the New Testament.[171] In both 6:14f and 18:35 the subject matter is similar and this association could have affected the syntax of 18:33.

v34 reverts to a form of sentence comparable with the early verses of the parable: Participle, subject and main Verb.
ὀργισθείς The closest parallel to this is Lk 14:21 Diff Mt 22:7 (see Lk 15:28 and its context).[172]
παρέδωκεν This is highly appropriate to the Q tradition of legal parables and to the Epistles' tradition of divine punishment. See Mt 5:25 (+ Dative).[173] The connection of 18:34 with 5:25-26 is strong in terms of vocabulary and subject matter.

---

[167] πονηρός has several nuances in Matthew: e.g. Baumbach, *Bösen*, 69ff. In *The Unforgiving Servant* and *The Talents* it means 'worthless'; see Prov 6:6.

[168] A parallel expression is found in Mk 6:55 Par Mt 14:35.

[169] The ending of a narrative by a final word from the main actor is typical of several synoptic parables, but is not exclusive to them: see Babrius, 13.

[170] The vocabulary item owes its presence (its first appearance in this parable) to associations outside the immediate text, as e.g. 1 Clem 13:1, Polycarp 2:3, Mt 5:17 Diff Lk, Test Zeb 7:1-2.

[171] Muraoka, *Use*, 51-72.

[172] See LXX: Ex 32:15; Daniel Bel 20; Test Lev 6:6.

[173] The judicial process is described, with the judge as subject handing the victim over to the marshal.

v35 is the conclusion of the parable, and resembles 6:14.[174] The main characteristic features of the verse are:

οὕτως may mark the end of a collection of sayings, as in 18:14. As a summary v35 is curious; first, because it picks up the Father's attitude (as 18:14 does) rather than the responsibility to forgive, and second, because the verse ends with four words ἀπὸ τῶν καρδιῶν ὑμῶν for which there has been no explicit preparation throughout the chapter. This could mean that 18:14 and 18:35 both contain earlier logia which have been adapted to a new context. Then the link-word οὕτως would mean 'Little wonder then that we conclude', i.e. a very general and imprecise connection.

ἀπὸ τῶν καρδιῶν ὑμῶν has interesting links with Test Gad 6:3-7.

ἀγαπᾶτε οὖν ἀλλήλους ἀπὸ καρδίας· καὶ ἐάν ἁμάρτῃ εἰς σέ εἰπὲ αὐτῷ ἐν εἰρήνῃ... καὶ ἐν ψυχῇ σου μὴ κρατήσῃς δόλον. καὶ ἐὰν ὁμολογήσας μετανοήσῃ ἄφες αὐτῷ.

ἀπὸ τῶν καρδιῶν ὑμῶν appears in Test Gad 6.1. Forgiveness, even of an offender, must not be affected by attitudes such as hatred or ill will. As in Rom 12:16, the concern is that vindictiveness may cause community discipline to miscarry.[175]

(iii) *The Tradition*

It is clear that 18:30-35 was written under the influence of Mt 6:14-15 (see also Sirach 28:1-2) and 5:25-26, and possibly under the influence of other parts of the Sermon on the Mount as well. 18:35 also corresponds to 18:14, both of which concentrate on the care for others which has its source in the Heavenly Father's will. Behind vv30-35 may stand a version of the parable's third scene comparable in style with the first two scenes; this third scene was then expanded at a subsequent stage. There is certainly evidence of this in the material surveyed (see v34), but insufficient to reconstruct that stage in detail. This means that there is evidence of a threefold parable in the pre-Matthean period, and of subsequent work which included the integrating of the parable through the four final words of 18:35 into the context of 18:15ff. The theory that an earlier threefold stage parable later extended through links with the Sermon on the Mount, and with other Matthean and Q parables, makes good sense. The later retelling of the parable retained the

---

[174] They share the description of God and the Conditional form with Future apodosis. They differ in these respects: 18:35 has a Singular Pronoun, the inversion of apodosis and protasis, the use of ἀδελφῷ and ἕκαστος, and in the final phrase. See Davies, *Matthew*, II 35.

[175] Rom 12:16 concerns personal vendettas rather than disciplinary cases. In either case the danger of vindictiveness is apparent. See Gnilka, *Kirche*, 51ff.

earlier narrative form of the first two scenes but destroyed the homogeneity of the narration by adaptations in the third scene.

If we assume that there was an even earlier stage, 18:21-35 has (roughly speaking) four stages. The earliest stage would have been a fictional narrative parallel to Lk 7:41. The second would have been a tersely narrated, fable-like version in three scenes. The third would have involved incorporation of the parable into a wider range of Q material, and the fourth the incorporation of this into the final form of the Matthean discourse.

Stage Two is of particular interest. Here was a particular style of parabolic narration, in Greek, without obvious Semitic origins, deeply influenced by the syntax and vocabulary of secular parallels. It is in the 'epic' style of parabolic narration. Its three scenes move toward a climax, foreseen in principle although not in detail from the beginning of the narrative, with a growing tension which demands of the hearer not only involvement in the plot but also an effort to resolve the meaning of what is happening. The in-built emotional features draw the hearer further into the story, at the same time allowing scope for reflection. Its substructure is clear, since it would be heard alongside many other similar stories of master and servants. Heard alongside them, aspects of the narrative gain prominence which concern the servants' attitudes.

Stage Three can be posited on the basis of the earlier discussion of the parable's context. If 18:15-20 is a pre-Matthean unit, then 18:15-35 as a whole could represent a development of the Q tradition at a pre-Matthean stage,[176] available to Matthew for incorporation into the discourse and constituting part of the first half of ch. 18 and much of its second half. What circumstances then could have caused the retelling of the epic version of the parable during Stage Three? The addition of the parable to the 'disciplinary' unit of 18:15-20 would have encouraged further reflection on the dangers of applying Lev 19:17f to community relationships, and perhaps the extension of the parable to include the final four words of 18:35.[177] No doubt the difficulties involved in excluding 'sinners' were apparent, both the practical and the theological difficulties. Barth[178] has suggested a connection between problems regarding the exclusion of sinners and the corpus mixtum Matthean tradition. Klein has suggested a particular form of Hellenistic Christian piety. The phrase ἔστω σοι ὥσπερ ὁ ἐθνικὸς καὶ ὁ τελώνης (18:17) could be evidence either for a Jewish Christian context or for a context where the conditions on which Gentiles and tax-collectors could be accepted in the Christian community had been agreed.[179] Perhaps it was in

[176] See pp.19-25.
[177] See p.22 n.21.
[178] Barth, *Kirchenzucht*, 167ff; Klein, *Frömmigkeit*.
[179] Herrenbrück, *Zöllner*, 244-249.

some such context that the third section of the parable could have been influenced by complementary ideas from the Sermon on the Mount. Just as the experience of the unforgiving servant brings him into conflict with his master, so the Sermon on the Mount uses picture language to evoke the terrrible consequences of such a conflict (5:25-26). Failing to live out standards recognized as valid for all followers of Christ is of crucial importance for this stage in the tradition. The specific links between the Sermon on the Mount and the third scene of the parable caused the final section to be rewritten, highlighting the nature of the Lord's judgment. 18:15-20 was then heard in a fresh context. God is the one who will judge, and he will judge all who do not make peace with their neighbours or their fellows. If the disciplinary context implied recognition of terms on which Gentiles could belong to the community, then the Gentile tone of the parable would be all the more relevant.

Stage Four in the history of the parable is the final shaping of the discourse as part of the final drafting of the Gospel. The continuous Marcan outline provided the opening question (18:1), a question to which the remainder of the discourse offered answers.[180] The two parables are part of the answer (see 18:4-5 for another part): the parable of *The Sheep* (18:12-14) and the parable of *The Unforgiving Servant* (18:23-35) provide demarcation points for the two halves of the discourse, and the second parable a climax and summary for the chapter as a whole.

These last two stages are defined here in terms of the sources involved. Stage Three introduced Q material; Stage Four introduced Marcan material. But it is by no means clear from the text that these stages were unrelated or distinctly separate developments. Stage Four can be regarded as a continuation of the Stage Three tradition during which Lev 19:17 was interpreted for community use. Stage Three already possessed in the two parables, *The Sheep* and *The Unforgiving Servant*, the emphasis on care for the little ones which marks chs. 18-21. Nevertheless it is possible to think of four stages in the development of the parable, each with their sources and concerns.

---

180 ταπεινόω is an evocative word in Matthew: at one level it relates to the discipline of children; at another to the humiliation suffered by all the faithful, up to and including John the Baptist and Jesus; at another to the Wisdom tradition advising submission to the divine will as the only way to avoid, for oneself and for others, the divine hubris; finally it relates to the moral level which inverts the prestige of power (e.g. Babrius, 112:10; 45:16). See ch.6 p.366 n.66.

(iv–v) *The History of the Parables and the History of Redaction*
The discourse in ch. 18 ends with an epic narrative parable. It has many aspects to its narration, and these operated in different ways during its history. Its present form is a literary redaction of the epic parable, an extended epic. In this version the parable encourages reflection on the first question raised by the chapter, even though the parable was not originally intended as its answer. The final four words of the discourse clinch the case that the parable is there to encourage reflection.[181] Attitudes, particularly the attitudes reflected in the parable, are of ultimate significance because in the end we are judged by the motives with which we engage with every part of our Christian responsibility. The parable encourages attention to the attitudes behind the actions. In this it corresponds to 25:31-45. As a reflective narrative it is part of a discourse which shares the same concerns and for which it provides a focus. Discourse and parable together offer ideas, pictures, images and concepts which contribute to our reading of what follows in Mt 19-22.

D. *The Sheep and the Goats* Mt 25:31-45

(i) *The Context*
Of all the narrative fictions considered so far, this deserves best the description of a summary parable. Not merely does it stand at the conclusion of the eschatological discourse; it occupies the position of final parable for the whole Gospel. Indeed there are indications that it was shaped for this purpose, to conclude the eschatological parables and to conclude the teaching of the Gospel. Alone of the summary parables it was formed for that purpose by the redactor, and alone of the parables it was intended as a focus for all Christ's teaching. The precedent of the summary parable was there to be used. Matthew had already followed it in two discourses (13:52; 18:23ff). At the end of the eschatological discourse the pattern was used again in a fresh and creative way.

Matthew chs. 24-25, like Mk 13, relate very closely to their previous and to their following context.[182] Mark 13 brings together two motifs: the failure of the people's leadership seen in the fate of the Temple, and the good news of Christ's death and vindication; and both of these are brought into relation to God's act of preparation for the coming judgment.[183] Matthew's

---

181 Thysman, *Communauté*.
182 Lambrecht, *Parousia*, 37ff; Via, *Matthew 25*, 83ff.
183 Grayston, *Mark XIII*, 371ff.

eschatological section has a similar function, but Mt 24-25 emphasize the ease with which Christ's followers can fail,[184] as Judas did.

Into this general outline provided by Mark 13, Matthew introduces three Q pericopes: First there is the material shared with Luke 17 (following on from the use of the material in Lk 17:1-4, which helped to shape the ch. 18 'community discourse'). This is found in Mt 24:26-28/Lk17:23-24,37 and Mt 24:37-40/Lk 17:26-27,30(?),34-35;[185] and its inclusion at this point may have been assisted by the overlap of Mk 13:15-16 with Lk 17:31/Mt 24:17-18.[186] It deals with the suddenness or the unexpectedness of the Son of Man's coming, meeting ignorance or unreadiness (see Mt 24:26 Diff Lk; his coming will not be ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, or ἐν τοῖς ταμιείοις; Mt 24:39 Diff Lk: οὐκ ἔγνωσαν).[187] Second, there is the material shared with Lk 12, perhaps following ch. 23's inclusion of material found in Lk 11:37-52.[188] This is introduced by Mt 24:42, which approximates both to Mk 13:35 (see also Mk 13:32f) and to Mt 24:44/Lk 12:40. Two of these units are characterized by a high degree of agreement between Matthew and Luke, Mt 24:42-44/Lk 12:39-40 and Mt 24:45-51/Lk 12:42-46, and the further unit, Mt 25:1ff/Lk 12:35-36, by very limited agreement. This material is concerned with attitudes to the coming of the Son of Man, since the exact time of his coming is unknown. Third, after a return to the Marcan outline (Mt 25:14/Mk 13:34)[189] there is the material which develops from the outline, and in particular the parable of *The Talents*.[190] This is probably Q material and part of the last (sequentially speaking) of the Q material available to Matthew. The effect of this parable is to define the call 'γρηγορεῖτε' in terms of those attitudes and actions which are consonant with the nature of the Lord who calls.[191]

The end of the eschatological discourse probably replaced a logion which may well have followed the parable of *The Talents* as the conclusion to the Q eschatological material: Mt 19:27f/Lk 22:28-30. Lk 22:28-30,[192] part of the Lucan Last Supper and the next Q material in Luke after the parable of *The Talents* (Lk 19:12-27), could well reflect by its present position in the Lucan Gospel the position which the logion originally had in that earlier body of eschatological material. A possible association between this logion

---

184 Pesch, *Eschatologie*, 224ff.

185 Schulz, *Q*, 279ff; Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 71ff; Marshall, *Luke*, 656f.

186 Lk 17:31 may derive from Mk 13:15-16; see Catchpole, *Q*, 248 n.56.

187 Gollinger, *Auslegung*, 239-243; Via, *Matthew 25*, 85.

188 The material in Lk 12:2-12 has already been used by Matthew in the 'mission discourse'.

189 See ch.7 p.463-464.

190 With its parallel, Lk 19:12-27.

191 Lövestam, *Wakefulness*, 78ff; Geddert, *Watchwords*.

192 Catchpole, *Poor on Earth*, 373f; see the discussion on pp.228-239.

and the parable of *The Sheep and the Goats*, suggested by the relative position of the logion to the parable of *The Talents* in Luke, has to be examined in detail.

(ii) *The Redaction*

The similarity of the opening of the *The Sheep and the Goats* to the logion Mt 19:27f/Lk 22:28-30 has often been discussed.[193] Not only are Mt 19:28 and 25:31 similar in structure and content, they have also unusual elements of content in common. Nowhere else in the synoptic tradition is the Son of Man spoken of as sitting on his own glorious throne.[194] The issue however is not simply that of similarity, nor even that of similarity in their distinctiveness. The issue is whether these are so similar and so unusual that the history of their traditions must be linked, and whether they could be linked in the way suggested above, namely that the logion was removed to an earlier point in the Gospel and the parable of *The Sheep and the Goats* took its place.

The possible relationships between 19:28 and 25:31 are many: 25:31 could be from a pre-Matthean source independent of 19:28 and used to displace 19:28; or 25:31 could be from a pre-Matthean source related to that of 19:28; or 25:31 could be editorial and formed from 19:28; or 25:31 could be editorial but formed without reference to 19:28.[195] And between those clearly stated relationships are many other more nuanced possibilities. These are the main alternatives which are discussed in the debate between Friedrich and Brandenburger. As we saw in Chapter One, there is a division of opinion between these two scholars regarding *The Sheep and the Goats*, a division of opinion which rests on their different methods of defining redaction, Friedrich emphasizing the linguistic evidence and Brandenburger setting greater store by a balance of linguistic and compositional evidence.

We begin with Friedrich's assessment of Mt 19:27f/Lk 22:28-30. He analyses all the New Testament parallels for Mt 25:31 and then all its traditional elements, concentrating particularly on the figure of the Judge. He concludes, in our view correctly, if for different reasons from those adduced in this book, that there is no literary dependence between 25:31 and 16:27 or Mk 8:38.[196] There are common interests between 25:31ff and 16:27 (the coming of the Son of Man and judgment according to works) but not a literary dependence. Friedrich prefers the Lucan text of the logion Mt 19:28/Lk 22:28-30 as closer to the original source. In his view Mt 19:28

---

[193] Robinson, *Sheep and the Goats*, 225ff; Schweizer, *Matthew*, 475; Friedrich, *Gott im Bruder*, 53ff; Brandenburger, *Recht.*

[194] Friedrich, *Gott im Bruder*, 120ff.

[195] Friedrich, *Gott im Bruder*, 54-66.

[196] Friedrich, *Gott im Bruder*, 48ff.

represents a strongly edited form. In 25:31 on the other hand he finds that Matthean redaction is unlikely, and that conclusion he defends on statistical evidence: only in the case of the words μετά and αὐτοῦ is redaction likely. There is, according to Friedrich, a promixity in Mt 25:31ff to the Enochic traditions, a proximity which may suggest that the whole of 25:31-46 belongs to a pre-Matthean tradition. Friedrich has been criticized for not taking seriously enough the possibility of links between 25:31 and Mt 10:40-42, in that he does not compare 25:31 with the earlier traditions behind Mt 10:40-42 and Mk 9:37 and 41.[197] But the evidence for a literary link between Mt 25:31ff and any level of that particular tradition is poor and he is right to discount it.[198] His conclusion therefore is that there is no literary dependence between 25:31ff and 16:27 or 10:40-42, and none between 25:31ff and 19:28. No origin for 25:31 is to be found in those passages or in the traditions behind them.

Brandenburger attacks Friedrich's method on four grounds: first, Friedrich's statistical work is, he maintains, based on the false assumption that Matthean Special Material cannot include editorial activity;[199] second, he argues that if Lk 22:28-30 is closer to the Q form of the logion than Mt 19:28, then the simplest explanation of the close similarity between Mt 19:28 and Mt 25:31 is that it is redactional in both places;[200] third, the parallels with the so-called Enochic elements are common elements in most forms of apocalyptic material;[201] fourth, there are other kinds of indications which suggest that 25:31/32a is redactional: e.g. 1) the tensions between Mt 25:31/32a and vv 32bff (the abrupt shift from 'Son of Man' in 25:31 to 'king' in 25:34, and the use of πάντα τὰ ἔθνη in 28:18-20 with reference to world mission when the same phrase is used in 25:32a in *The Sheep and the Goats* material, where it seems specifically to concern Christians); 2) the Matthean theme of universal judgment by deeds; 3) the Son of Man's judgment as in 24:3; and 4) the Christological emphasis implied in ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης αὐτοῦ in 19:28 and 25:31.[202] So Brandenburger's theory of Matthew's redactional method is that Matthew built 25:31/32a on Mk 8:38, with its Christological and theophanic orientation as this was developed in Mt 16:27 (see Zech 14:5). He concedes that ἔμπροσθεν (25:32a) falls

---

197 Catchpole, *Poor on Earth*, 395, 369ff.

198 The evidence for a pre-Marcan link between 9:33-36 and 9:37-42 is hard to find, and παιδίον in 9:36,37 provides a good explanation of how they came to be joined. Catchpole's argument depends on a pre-Marcan form including 9:37 and 9:41.

199 Brandenburger, *Recht*, 38.

200 Brandenburger, *Recht*, 41f.

201 Brandenburger, *Recht*, 42-45.

202 Brandenburger, *Recht*, 45-51.

outside that pattern.[203] His conclusion is that 25:31/32a creates a literary composition forming a new context in which the traditional material which follows finds a fresh significance.[204]

Brandenburger is of course correct in his attack on Friedrich's statistical methods. Friedrich has confused descriptive analysis of vocabulary with evaluative analysis. But Brandenburger's own methods are also fallible because of their incompleteness. He does not follow through the vocabulary studies sufficiently far to produce a map of the relevant synoptic usages. The complete map shows traditional expressions and formulaic features in 25:31f which require a more complex solution to the problems there.[205] We shall

---

[203] Brandenburger, *Recht*, 53.

[204] Brandenburger, *Recht*, 56ff.

[205] (i) ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ...

ὅταν

Mt	19x:	8x No Par; 6x Par Mk; 2x Par Lk, 1x Diff Mk; 1x Diff Lk; 1x Par Mk or Lk.
Mk	21x:	6x Par Mt; 6x > ; 1x >*; 8x Diff Mt.
Lk	29x:	13x No Par; 8x Par Mk; 2x Par Mt; 5x Diff Mt; 1x Par Mt or Par Mk.

Significant elements of this analysis can be broken down as follows:

Mt 1x Diff Mk > ; 1x Diff Lk > (15:2; 21:40).

Mk 8x Diff Mt 2x Diff μέλλω; 1x ἕως; 1x ἐν + Dative; 1x Genitive. 1x Genitive Absolute; 1x > ; 1x Participle.

Lk 5x Diff Mt = 2x > ; 1x >*; 1x ἐάν; 1x Genitive Absolute.

See Gundry, *Matthew*, 646; Schweizer, *Erwartung*, 60 n.1; Broer, *Gericht*, 277; Gaston, *Horae Synopticae*, gives no judgment on the editorial character of this usage; Friedrich, *Gott im Bruder*, 14, classifies it 'matt. Red. unwahrscheinlich'; see Schenk, *Sprache*, 26, for the variations of meaning, construction and adverbial use.

ὅταν δέ

Mt	6x; 3x	No Par (6:16; 10:23; 25:31);
	1x	Par Mk (10:19; Mk > δέ);
	1x	Par Lk (12:43 followed by τότε; Lk > δέ, τότέ);
	1x	Diff Mk or Par Lk (Mt 10:19) = Diff Mk or Par Lk 12:11.
Mk	2x; 2x	Diff Mt (1x Diff μελλήσετε δέ; 1x Diff οὖν).
Lk	2x; 2x	Par Mt; see above.
Jn	3x; 1x	ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ; see also 1 Cor 13:10.

The number of Matthean uses is noteworthy, as is the formulaic ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ.

δέ is presented by Gaston:

Total	Mk	Q	QMt	QLk	M	L	MTAdd	LkAdd	Edit Mk	Edit Mt	Edit Lk
1015	155	32	22	31	220	292	137	126	17	16	172

It is possible that ὅταν δὲ should be regarded as a formulaic opening.

(ii) ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ.

δόξα

Mt 8x:	2x No Par; 2x Par Lk; 2x Par Mk; 1x No Par or Diff Lk; 1x Text?
Mk 3x:	2x Par Mt; 1x Diff Mt
Lk 13x:	9x No Par; 2x Par Mt; 2x Par Mk

(Gaston, *Horae Synopticae*, has 8x No Par; 1x Par Mk.)
Friedrich, *Gott im Bruder*, 118, gives Mt 19:28 as Diff Lk, since Mt 19:28 and Lk 22:30 share ten words. Schenk classifies δόξα under βασιλεία and uses this association to clarify Mt 16:27-28. Like Friedrich he works with Theisohn's presuppositions on 1 Enoch: *Sprache*, 91f.

ἐν Mt 291x: 109x No Par; 56x Par Mk; 60x Diff Mk; 44x Par Lk; 22x Diff Lk
On the basis of this, Friedrich suggests: 'Zwar ist matt. Red. möglich. Angesichts des hohen Sg-Vorkommens lautet jedoch das Ergebnis: matt Red unwahrscheinlich' (*Gott im Bruder*, 18). In view of the Marcan and Lucan uses (e.g. Mk 1:2 Diff Mt 3:2; Mk 1:16 Diff Mt 4:18; Mk 1:20 >*Mt) and the numerous formulae employing ἐν (spatial, temporal and thematic), e.g. Mt 6:9 Diff Lk; 7:11 Diff Lk, it would be unwise to put any weight on this item whatsoever.

αὐτοῦ
Gaston, *Horae Synopticae*, treats αὐτοῦ as Mt Ed. He offers as evidence:

Total	Mk	Q	QMt	QLk	M	L	MTAdd	LkAdd	Edit Mk	Edit Mt	Edit Lk
2137	746	66	47	36	326	653	151	112	135	215	187

Friedrich, *Gott im Bruder*, also suggests that αὐτός is Mt redactional.
Mt 906x: 326x No Par; 316x Par Mk; 151x Diff Mk; 66x Par Lk; 47x Diff Lk.
However, a different impression is given by a total map of αὐτοῦ·
Mt 268x:98x No Par;62x Par Mk;54x Diff Mk;30x Par Lk;18x Diff Lk;6x Text?
Mk 174x:62x Par Mt; 10x Diff Mt; 2x >*Mt; 18x >*; 82x >
Lk 247x:151x No Par;32x Par Mk;26x Diff Mk;30x ParMt;2x Diff Mt;6x Text?
The whole phrase ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ appears:

Mt	6:29	Par Lk (Lk 12:27; in both parallels with πάσῃ).	
	16:27	Par Mk (Mk 8:38); both with τοῦ πατρός.	
	25:31	No Par	
Mk	8:38	Par Mt	
	10:37	Diff Mt	Mk καθίσωμεν ἐν τῇ δόξῃ σοῦ. Mt καθίσωσιν...ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου.
		Contrast Mt 19:28 δόξης/Lk 22:30 βασιλείαν.	
Lk	9:26	Par Mk	
	12:27	Par Mt	
See	24:26	No Par	εἰς τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ.

(iii) πάντες οἱ ἄγγελοι μετ' αὐτοῦ.
ἄγγελοι Schenk, *Sprache*, 6; Gundry, *Matthew*, 641.

Mt 20x:	11x No Par; 5x Par Mk; 1x Diff Mk; 2x Par Lk; 0x Diff Lk; 1x Diff Mk or No Par
Mk 6x:	5x Par Mt; 1x >
Lk 26x:	20x No Par; 1x Par Mk; 2x Par Mt; 3x Diff Mt

Of these the following refer in the Synoptics to a human messenger:
Mt 1x Par Lk; Mk 1:2 > Mt; Lk 1x No Par; 1x Par Mt; 1x Diff Mt
Mt 11:10, Mk 1:2, Lk 7:27 quote Malachi 3:1 (see LXX).
Mt 2x Par Lk are both LXX quotations: see ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ Mt 4:6.
ἄγγελος κυρίου is incorrectly represented in Schenk: corrected it reads
Mt 5x No Par 1:20; 1:24; 2:13; 2:19; 28:2 (No Par or Diff Mk)
Lk 2x 1:11; 2:9 (Luke, *Greek*, 4,9).
Angels and the Son of Man:
Mt 6x

13:39 Predicate to θερισταί.

13:41 Sent by the Son of Man; with αὐτοῦ.

13:49 Separating evil from good and committing the evil to the fire.

16:27 With αὐτοῦ in Mt Diff Mk; with ἁγίων in Mk and Lk.

24:31 With αὐτοῦ in Mt Diff Mk; sent by Son of Man to gather elect.

25:31 Uniquely with πάντες; but see Rev 7:11 of all the angels before the throne. See also Mt 25:41 of the opposing group of the devil's angels.

ἄγγελοι αὐτῶν 18:10 The evidence is insufficient for Schenk's judgment that the angels are 'the righteous dead' here, although it would be consonant with the 'flashback' in 18:31 (see also 22:30 Par Mk). See Thompson, *Divided Community*, 154 n.8; Quispel, *Makarius*; Carson, *Matthew*, 400-401. See 22:43 No Par or Diff Mk of a 'ministering angel'; in the Plural Mt 4:11 Par Mk.

The uses of the Genitive after ἄγγελοι (Mt 13x) are regarded by Schenk as Matthean. The evidence of Lk 12:8f Diff Mt, Lk 15:10 (see Mt 18:14, Lk 1:11; 2:9; 2:13) cautions against too firm a judgment on this point. To decide the text-critical issue at 22:30 on those grounds is unwise (on 22:30 see Legg, *Matthew*, ad loc.). The significance of πάντες in 25:31 (as against 16:27; 24:31; see the textual variants there: Legg, *Matthew*) is overlooked by Schenk.

μετά with the Genitive is given by Friedrich a possibly redactional label. A redactional label with whatever qualification is unwise. See Gaston, *Horae Synopticae*, 63; Schenk, *Sprache*, 360. The total map is:

Mt 60x: 15x No Par; 15x Par Mk; 20x Diff Mk; 6x Par Lk; 3x Diff Lk; 1x Diff Lk or No Par

Mk 45x: 15x Par Mt; 5x Diff Mt; 9x >*; 13x > ; 3x Text?

Lk 50x: 32x No Par; 8x Par Mk; 4x Diff Mk; 6x Par Mt

Schenk, in dependence on Frankemölle's Deuteronomic theory and Kingsbury's redactional methods, extrapolates from Mt 1:23 and 28:20 a wider use of μετά + Genitive, with Christological and theological relevance. The importance of the 'total map' approach to linguistic statistics is nowhere more evident than here. If Schenk is right, then crucially important theological and Christological uses of μετά + Genitive are omitted by Matthew from Mark. See Mk 3:7 >*; Mk 5:18 > ; Mk 5:24 Diff Mt; 6:50 Diff Mt; Mk 14:44 >*. As far as μετά + ἑαυτῶν is concerned, see Mk 8:14 Diff Mt and the textual problem at Mk 9:8. Perhaps more important are the alternative expressions available instead of μετά + Genitive, e.g. the simple καί: for this, see Lk 22:16 Diff Mk καί; Mk 15:1 Diff Mt καί. The patterns of μετά with Verbs (e.g. ἦλθεν μετά) are also not considered by Schenk. The same pattern can be observed there, e.g. the Mk Diff Mt uses of ἀκολουθέω.

(iv) τότε

Gaston, *Horae Synopticae*, 83; Friedrich, *Gott im Bruder*, 19; Gundry, *Matthew*, 648; Schenk, *Sprache*, 446.

Mt 91x: 29x No Par; 5x Par Mk; 43x Diff Mk; 2x Par Lk; 9x Diff Lk; 2x Diff Lk or No Par; 1x Text?

Mk 6x: 5x Par Mt; 1x Diff Mt(>*)

Lk 15x: 4x No Par; 4x Par Mk; 2x Diff Mk; 2x Par Mt; 2x Diff Mt; 1x Text?

On the use of τότε in direct speech, see Friedrich, *Gott im Bruder*, 19, who regards this is as a feature of Matthew's Special Source. There are six uses in Mt 25:31-46; consecutive uses are also found in *The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs* (27x; see 6x Test Simeon 6:3-7). This makes the omission from Mt

see this particularly in relation to συναχθήσονται τὰ ἔθνη. 25:31f could well be classified as 'traditional'.

In 19:28 too traditional elements in the development of both Marcan and Q material make it conceivable that the logion Mt 19:28/Lk 22:28-30 was available to the final redactor of Matthew's Gospel in a different form[206]

24:31 (see Mark 13:27 Diff Mt), which avoids the consecutive use of τότε, and from 22:7 (see Lk 14:21 Diff Mt) all the more interesting. On the use with ὅτε, see p.316 n.125. On the use of τότε in narrative introductions, see the general background on p.14 n.14. On ἀπὸ τότε as a 'climactic divider' and on τότε ἤρξατο, p.31 n.37. 9:6 ('next' Diff Mk) makes the anacolouthon easier to follow. 27:16 ('at that time' Diff Mk) is not to be confused with the τότε with ἐπληρώθη in 2:17 and 27:9 ('in this way'?). There are 22 uses at the beginning of a sentence. This pattern is not exclusive to Matthew; see Lk 21:10 Diff Mk (and Mt). Schenk refers to τότε replacing the Marcan καί, but makes no reference to cases where τότε replaces δέ in Mark and/or Luke. The argument regarding τότε λέγει hangs on the dubious theory that the Historical Present is a macrosyntactical marker; see n.165 above. For an example where the formulaic rather than the macrosyntactical theory for τότε λέγει is superior, see Mt 12:24 Diff Lk; for examples where it is superior to the causal theory proposed by Schenk, see Mt 26:3,14.

(v) ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης αὐτοῦ.

This is only paralleled in the Synoptic Gospels in Mt 19:28. Other biblical references to a heavenly throne other than God's throne are messianic (Lk 1:32), or in the heavenly court (Dan 7:10; Mt 10:32), or by way of promise or reward or exaltation (Mt 19:26f/Lk 22:28ff). In Rev 20:11-15 no distinction can easily be made between Christ as divine Judge and as final Judge (Sweet, *Revelation*, 288), and that may be the case here. On the difficulty of dating the 'throne' traditions, see Casey, *Son of Man*, ch. 4. It is unwise to suggest a linear development such as Friedrich proposes (*Gott im Bruder*, 122).

[206] The Matthean context surrounding 19:28 depends heavily on Mark and, as we have seen, the 19:28 logion has probably been brought forward by the redactor from its association with the parable of *The Talents* to this point. The cluster of agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark in the surrounding context of 19:28 is therefore of great interest: οὐρανοῖς Mt 19:21=Lk18:22; the omission of Mark 10:24; διὰ τρήματος...εἰσελθεῖν Mt 19:24=Lk 18:25 (note also the retention in Mt 19:24 of βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ); ἀκούσαντες Mt 19:25=Lk 18:26; εἶπεν (δέ) Mt 19:27=Lk 18:29, repeated in the introduction to 19:28=Lk 18:18; πολλαπλασίονα Mt 19:29 (B L 1010 sa)=Lk 18:30. ὑμεῖς οἱ might well be Q (Schürmann, *Abschiedsrede*, 37; Dupont, *Douze Trônes*, 312f) and the Lucan Participles may be redactional (Jeremias, *Sprache*, 290; pace Friedrich, *Gott im Bruder*, 57). Friedrich's statistical survey of ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς (see *Gott im Bruder*) takes no account of this interesting feature. One or two of these cases might be explained as anticipations of the Q addition, but not all of them. The possibility of an intermediate Marcan form between our canonical text and the Matthean and Lucan use is at least a hypothesis for consideration here. The Matthean and Lucan ὅτι (Mt 19:28=Lk 18:29 Diff Mk >*) which follows ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν is a particularly intriguing example of agreement. Friedrich, *Gott im*

from that known by Luke (e.g. see the usage almost unique to the New Testament of παλιγγενεσία[207]); and it is also conceivable that the developed

---

Bruder, 56, assumes a redactional improvement of style by both Matthew and Luke, but the overview of ὅτι and ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι does not support this.
ὅτι= that
Mt 87x: 36x No Par; 20x Par Mk; 15x Diff Mk; 10x Par Lk; 4x Diff Lk; 1x Diff Lk or Diff Mk; 1x Diff Lk or No Par
Mk 84x: 21x Par Mt; 11x Diff Mt; 32x >*Mt; 2x > Mt; 14x > ; 4x Text?
Lk 99x: 48x No Par; 17x Par Mk; 9x Diff Mk; 11x Par Mt; 5x Diff Mt; 1x No Par or Diff Mk; 2x No Par or Diff Mt; 6x Text?
These can be divided into:
ὅτι recitativum
Mt 44x: 15x No Par; 9x Par Mk; 8x Diff Mk; 7x Par Lk; 4x Diff Lk; 1x Diff Lk or Diff Mk
Mk 56x: 9x Par Mt; 3x Diff Mt; 31x >*Mt; 1x > Mt; 8x > ; 3x Text?
Lk 57x: 24x No Par; 10x Par Mk; 5x Diff Mk; 6x Par Mt; 5x Diff Mt; 1x No Par or Diff Mk; 2x No Par or Diff Mt; 4x Text?
ὅτι indicating context of thought or speech
Mt 43x: 21x No Par; 11x Par Mk; 7x Diff Mk; 3x Par Lk; 0x Diff Lk; 1x Diff Lk or No Par
Mk 28x: 12x Par Mt; 8x Diff Mt; 1x >*Mt; 1x > Mt; 6x > ; 1x Text?
Lk 42x: 24x No Par; 7x Par Mk; 4x Diff Mk; 5x Par Mt; 0x Diff Mt; 2x Text.
Uses with (ἀμὴν) λέγω are: ἀμὴν
Mt 31x: 12x No Par; 8x Par Mk; 2x Diff Mk; 0x Par Lk; 9x Diff Lk
Mk 13x: 8x Par Mt; 3x Diff Mt; 2x > Mt
Lk 6x: 1x No Par; 3x Par Mk; 1x Diff Mk; 1x Diff Mt.
(ἀμὴν) λέγω (δὲ, γὰρ) ὅτι
Mt 26x: 9x No Par; 5x Par Mk; 2x Diff Mk; 5x Par Lk; 3x Diff Lk; 2x No Par or Diff Lk
Mk 9x: 5x Par Mt; 3x Diff Mt; 1x > Mt
Lk 12x: 4x No Par; 1x Par Mk; 5x Par Mt; 2x Diff Mt. See also λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν 4x Diff Mt.
The variations with (+) and without (>) ὅτι are complex: e.g.
Mt 10:15 > / Lk 10:12 +; Mt 19:28 = Lk 18:29 + / Mk 10:29 > ;
Mt 16:28 = Mk 9:1 + / Lk 9:27 > ; Mk 12:43 = Lk 21:3 + / Mt > ;
Mt 26:29 = Mk 14:25 + / Lk 22:18 >.
The uses of ὅτι with λέγω ([λέγω] = use of λέγω Diff Parallel)
λέγω
Mt 34x: 9x No Par; 9x Par Mk; 8x Diff Mk; 4x Par Lk; 4x Diff Lk
Mk 32x: 9x Par Mt; 2x Diff Mt; 21x >*Mt
Lk 33x: 21x No Par; 2x Par Mk; 3x Diff Mk; 4x Par Mt; 3x Diff Mt; 2x No Par or Diff Mt.
[λέγω] Mt 2x: 1x Par Mk; 1x Diff Mk (both Participles).
Compare this with the uses of ὅτι with ἀκούω, ἀναγινώσκω, γράφω, δοκέω, οἶδα, μιμνήσκω. Schenk, *Sprache*, 378, quotes Neirynck to the effect that Mt has cut out ὅτι recitativum 37x over against his Marcan source. He fails to point out that in 25x of these Luke does also. For the causal use of ὅτι, see Vinson, *Enthymemes*, although the total map is by no means as clear as Vinson suggests.

[207] For παλιγγενεσία, see p.45 n.76.

Q form was introduced by means of the phrase ἀκολουθήσαντές μοι[208] into a Marcan context which itself had been rephrased, perhaps even reorganized.[209] The Matthean editor's intention in introducing the Q

---

[208] According to Friedrich, *Gott im Bruder*, 57f, ἀκολουθήσαντες is redactional. For a survey of recent work on ἀκολουθέω, see Schenk, *Sprache*, 347. He is rightly critical of Kingsbury's treatment of the ὄχλοι passages (4:25; 8:1; 14:13, etc.); but he fails to evaluate the agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark (see Fuchs, *Untersuchungen*; see also n.206 above). See the use of ὄχλοι as possible indications of non-editorial uses (see van Tilborg, *Jewish Leaders*, 145; Schenk, *Sprache*, 349-351, designates these +Q):

Mt 4:25	ὄχλοι	Mk 1:36f	-	Lk 4:42	ὄχλοι
12:23	ὄχλοι (see 9:33)	3:22	-	11:14	ὄχλοι
13:2	ὄχλοι πολλοὶ	4:1	ὄχλος πλεῖστος	8:4	ὄχλου πολλοῦ
14:13	ὄχλοι ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ	6:33	-	9:11=Mt 14:13.	
14:14	πολὺν ὄχλον	6:34	πολὺν ὄχλον	9:11	-
14:15	ὄχλους	6:36	-	9:12	ὄχλον
14:19	ὄχλους/ὄχλοις	6:41	-	9:16	-/ὄχλῳ.

Kingsbury, 'Ακολουθεῖν, 56-73, is not able to reduce the redaction to a community picture with a single focus, and the variables which he notes could be variables within the traditions. Schenk prefers an abstract conceptual link ('accompany'; 'being a disciple'), but this belongs with his general semantic assumptions rather than as a result of observations of Matthean usage.

[209] 19:28 does not read easily. If Matthew introduced it here, the three additional phrases which would have been essential links to accommodate it to the context would have been ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι (see Luke 18:29 and n.206 above), ἀκολουθήσαντές μοι (see Mt 19:27) and και αυτοι (ℵ D L Z; the more difficult reading) Diff Lk (answering the question in 28a). ὑμεῖς οἱ provides the opening subject of the Q sentence (see n.206 above). Beyond that opening subject the structure of the Q material is difficult to identify. The Lucan form is Lucan by vocabulary and theology (Jeremias, *Sprache*, 290), so if the Participle (ἀκολουθήσαντες or διαμεμενηκότες) is redactional in both versions we have no hint of what the original syntax might have been, whether ὑμεῖς was the subject of an extended sentence as in Matthew or of a predicative statement as in Luke, and whether or not, if there was a Participle, the Participle was followed by a prepositional phrase. Possible traditional elements in Lk 22:29c,30 suggest how the logion may have ended, but 22:29c,30ab would have been entirely suited to the new Matthean context; there is no reason why, if Matthew knew that form, he should have omitted those phrases. This makes the awkward shape of Mt 19:28 all the more remarkable. It is the position of καὶ αὐτοί which creates the problem. If the logion was originally a single sentence, why did Matthew choose (if we follow ℵ D L Z) to add αὐτοί and καὶ after καθήσεσθε and not before ὑμεῖς οἱ? The answer is probably that the promise given in καθήσεσθε would only apply to 'those who had followed him' according to a condition already present in the Matthean tradition (ὅταν καθίσῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου); there was already in the form which Matthew knew a preliminary phrase underlining and explaining the future form καθήσεσθε (see also Mk 10:30d). The addition καὶ αὐτοί would also suggest that this preliminary phrase included the verbal root 'sit'. If the preliminary phrase did include the word 'sit' (i.e. on the throne), then the addition ἐν παλιγγενεσίᾳ is inexplicable in Matthean terms. If he wanted to

material at 19:28 would presumably have been to strengthen the future dimension in the discussion of discipleship. That intention highlights the two features which make 19:28 different from 25:31ff: the emphasis on the Twelve and the emphasis on the Twelve judging the tribes of Israel.[210] By contrast, in 25:31-32 the Son of Man alone occupies the throne and it is πάντα τὰ ἔθνη who are gathered before him. It is therefore possible that the redactor introduced the Mt 19:28 logion at this earlier position, and did so knowing that at the ending of the eschatological discourse he could replace it with a similar picture of judgment involving the Son of Man.

25:31 and 19:28 are both, in view of these arguments, traditional, and they are perhaps independent. In that case the form of the logion used by the redactor for 19:28, and the tradition which he used for the opening of the parable of *The Sheep and the Goats*, belong to a stage in the development of the Son of Man material which needs a more exact description. In 19:28 and 25:31 the Son of Man sits on his, not the Father's, throne of glory, and himself delivers the final judgment which rewards the righteous and punishes sinners. This stage is associated by Friedrich with 1 Enoch 37-71 but is treated by Brandenburger as a commonplace of apocalyptic language. Additionally 25:31 leads into a parable where the term βασιλεύς (25:34) is used with reference to the same figure. The kingly authority of the Chosen One in 1 Enoch 37-71 provides, according to Friedrich, a further link between this stage of the Son of Man material and 1 Enoch, whereas for Brandenburger βασιλεύς is a sign that the redactor is moving from the literary framework to his traditional material, from the new Christological focus within the literary framework to the older apocalyptic tradition.

Brandenburger is right that 25:31 represents a new focus for the Son of Man material in Matthew. The main area of Marcan use of the Son of Man material is represented in Matthew: Christ's authority is claimed, rejected and vindicated.[211] The element of rejection is extended by means of the Q material, which speaks of the Son of Man in the sequence of the persecuted

---

add an explanatory temporal phrase why he did not write ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν (see 19:21-23)? We cannot be sure in such a speculative area, but the Matthean adaptation of the logion in 19:28 may have been an adaptation of a Marcan tradition which included phrases such as we find in the present form of 19:28. The Marcan context had itself undergone several developments: Mt 19:21 has the Adjective τέλειος, a traditional imperatival form (p.19 n.19), a possessions/poor contrast, and (with Luke) a contrast between treasure here and treasure in heaven. For a possible theory, see Cope, *Matthew*, 111-117.

[210] Casey, *Son of Man*, 188-192.

[211] Mt 9:6; 12:8; 16:21; 17:22; 24:30; 26:24; 26:45; 26:64; see Grayston, *Dying, We Live*, 183.

(8:20;[212] 11:19[213]), and by additions to the Marcan material, heightening the contrast between the one who is judged and the one who is to be judge of all (26:2),[214] offering him as a paradigm to follow (20:28). The range of the Son of Man's authority is extended in Matthew, as it is shared (9:5-8),[215] as it is defined in relation to the Law (12:8), and as his vindication is maintained (12:40; 26:64). The result of these changes is a heightened contrast between the lowliness and the majesty of the Son of Man and a deepened awareness of the solidarity of the Son of Man with those who suffer.[216] The coming of the Son of Man receives attention in the early traditions taken over by Matthew (10:23) and also in the developed form in which he comes as judge (13:37ff; 16:27; 24:27,30f). So in the two references in 19:28 and 25:31, where he is referred to as sitting in judgment in his glory, in 19:28 the Son of Man identifies himself with those for whom his lowliness has been the paradigm to follow (19:27), and in 25:31 there is a visionary justification of all the Son of Man is and does. 25:31 has provided a new focus; in it the Son of Man material in Matthew is drawn together in a new synthesis.

On that issue Brandenburger is correct. 25:31b is a new focus for the Son of Man material. But it is not a focus which results from redactional composition. Our detailed analysis of style and language suggests that, in those respects at least, it is traditional and not redactional. Brandenburger argues of course that 25:31 is redactional on other grounds, on the criterion of inconsistency of vocabulary items between 25:31 and 25:34, and on the basis of an alleged shift of genre and milieu between 25:31 and 25:34. It is true that one of the canons of redactional criticism is inconsistency between

---

[212] Casey, *Son of Man*, 229. This logion and the following logion in 8:21-22 take a positive view of the homeless style of life. It hints at rejection and persecution. The pictures are those who travel from place to place, although it is not clear if these are solitaries or groups, e.g. 'the fox', or packs, e.g. 'the jackals', or scavenging vultures or migrant flocks. It is unlikely that 1 En 42 was influential here, pace Hamerton-Kelly, *Wisdom*, 43.

[213] See the discussion of *The Children's Games* on pp.267f. Matthew's concern in ch. 11 is, in part at least, with the continuity of persecution from the prophets to the time of John the Baptist and Jesus, and the significance of this for an understanding of the Kingdom.

[214] See Mt 26:2 Diff Mk 14:1, and p.238 below; also Grams, *Conflict*, 61.

[215] See Mt 9:8 Diff Mk 2:12. The sharing of the Son of Man's authority is an important feature of Matthew's Gospel. New possibilities have been opened up by the Son of Man which the Christian community and its leadership enjoy. See Hummel, *Auseinandersetzung*, 37; Held, *Wundergeschichten*, 165ff; Gatzweiler, *Miracles*, 209ff; Cope, *Matthew*, Analysis 4. On the origins of this shared role, see Hooker, *Mark*, 93.

[216] See Stanton, *Gospel*, 223, although Stanton limits the solidarity in Mt 25:31-46 to solidarity with the chosen ones.

vocabulary items and within 'schemes' of presentation; and Brandenburger is employing this canon when he assumes that the movement from Son of Man in 25:31 to βασιλεύς in 25:34 requires us to assume à shift from redaction in 25:31 to tradition in 25:34. So we must ask: is this move from Son of Man to King genuinely an example of 'inconsistency' of diction, and is it accompanied by a shift of genre or milieu?

Catchpole too is interested in the relationship of 25:31 and 25:34; but he is concerned to resist any argument[217] for attributing v31 and v34 to separate sources. He does this on a number of grounds, but notably because 'king' is contextually appropriate in the judgment scene as described in 25:31ff. It is unnecessary to differentiate between the opening reference to 'Son of Man' in 25:31 and the later designation 'king', if by Son of Man is meant the one 'who is seated on the glorious throne'. The point is well made, although in one respect Catchpole moves beyond the Matthean evidence. He wishes to place the 'Son of Man' reference in 25:31 in a pre-Matthean tradition so that it cannot be claimed as a Matthean gloss on an earlier 'king' parable (vv 34ff); but this leads him to conclude that the 'Son of Man' in 25:31, even though he stands in a one-to-one correspondence to those who have suffered, is not necessarily one who has personally suffered hardship. Catchpole is justified in claiming that the context provided in 25:31f, the session on his glorious throne, itself leads to an identification of the Son of Man with the King. But he is wrong to assume that the Son of Man could not have suffered personally (compare 25:31 and 26:2 Diff Mk).

While Catchpole resolves the important issue of whether 'inconsistency of language' requires us to assume a break after v31/32a, both he and Brandenburger fail to do justice to the text of 25:31-32 at one significant point (a point which Brandenburger recognized as falling outside his theory): it is the use of the Preposition ἔμπροσθεν. The use of ἔμπροσθεν in 25:32 is not in itself particularly remarkable; what makes it noteworthy is its role in the Passion Narrative which follows. The Son of Man who comes in judgment was himself judged. 26:2 hints at this through its repetition of Son of Man (a repetition absent from Mark), and so do the opening words of 25:32: ἔμπροσθεν[218] is characteristic of the Matthean Passion and also of

---

[217] Catchpole, *Poor on Earth*, offers eight grounds for resisting the secondariness of the 'Son of Man' references in 25:31. He is right to argue that the reference to the 'throne of glory' prepares the way for the reference to 'king', that the 'king' differentiates himself from God in the Passive Participles of blessing and cursing (vv34-41), and that the logion Mt 19:28/Lk 22:29-30 provides an analogy to the parable which does not require the hypothesis that the parable originally referred to God as king.

[218] ἔμπροσθεν. Schenk, *Sprache*, 239; Gundry, *Matthew*, 643.

Mt 18x: 8x No Par 5:16,24; 6:1,2; 7:6; 23:14; 25:32; 27:11;
23:14 might be classified No Par or Diff Lk.

Matthew's technique of building links between passages by the repetition of particular words. In the Passion the word assists what has been called the 'crescendo effect' of the narrative. More might be claimed: that Matthew intends a juxtaposition of Son of Man in glory and Son of Man humiliated, so that the identification of the judge with the sufferers may be given a Christological foundation. One word is too narrow a base for so weighty a conclusion, but it could be that the combination of the repeated references to the Son of Man, the role of ἔμπροσθεν in the Matthean Passion Narrative and the literary technique of vocabulary repetition (to say nothing of the 'foreshadowing effect' of ἔμπροσθεν in 25:32) do point to an interest on the redactor's part. The link between 25:32 and the Passion is probable enough. It is a matter of defining adequately its character and force.

	1x	Par Mk	Mt 17:2;
	2x	Diff Mk	Mt 26:70; 27:29;
	4x	Par Lk	Mt 10:32ab; 11:10,26;
	3x	Diff Lk	Mt 10:33ab Diff ἐνώπιον; 18:14;
Mk 2x:	1x	Par Mt; 1x > .	
Lk 10x:	4x	Par Mt;	
	6x	No Par Lk 5:19; 14:2; 19:4; 19:27; 19:28; 21:36; but see Mt Diff Mk 2:12.	

Friedrich concludes 'matt Red möglich', noting particularly the use of ἔμπροσθεν over against ἐνώπιον (see however Jeremias, *Sprache*, 36, for the Lucan character of the latter). Schenk divides up the usages of ἔμπροσθεν, noting eight Matthean uses which 'have a macro-syntactic significance': they are each followed by an extended commentary; one of these is 25:32. In the case of 25:32 this approach results in a clumsy translation, and raises the question whether there are better explanations than the macro-syntactic option. It could be argued that there is just as much of a 'macro-syntactic effect' in 17:2 Par Mk, where the effect might arguably be traced in Mark as well. A better explanation is that within the Matthean tradition there is a strong emphasis on the contrast between human and divine judgment (Syreeni, *Structure*); and ἔμπροσθεν has an important role in that context: 5:16; 6:1; 10:32a,33a are part of a challenge to Jewish leaders (Garland, *Matthew 23*, 126), and 23:14 corresponds to a Lucan Woe (on the numeration of this verse, see Garland, *Matthew 23*, 15 n.17). This leaves 25:32 and the three Passion Narrative uses (26:70; 27:11,29), described by Senior as having a 'crescendo effect' in the Trial (Senior, *Passion*, 199-200). These intensify the impact of Peter's refusal to identify himself with Jesus and the emotional power of the mock homage (Senior, *Passion*, 225, 268; Brown, *Death*, I 868). They are, as Senior indicates in relation to 27:11, stock phrases in many trial contexts and as such create a link between 25:32 and the Passion. In terms of the choice of vocabulary here three factors interact: the tradition, the overall interest in contrasting human and divine judgment, and the suggestions raised about the Trial Narrative by the use of ἔμπροσθεν in 25:32.

(iii) *The Tradition*

So far we have argued that 25:31 is not dependent on Mk 8:39, 16:27 or Mt 19:28. It is itself tradition, as Mt 19:28 was. However, although 25:31 is tradition, it brings the presentation of the Son of Man in Matthew to a new focus, one which recognizes the Universal Judge as the Sufferer, himself unjustly judged. Moreover, 25:31 ought not to be isolated from either 25:32 or 25:34. All those verses could belong to a single context, 25:31-34, which Matthew understands in relation to the Passion Narrative. Such an association can be traced in contemporary material. Two major passages, Daniel 7:9-14 and 1 Enoch 37-71, illustrate the possibilities of such an association, and suggest further ways in which the gap between Son of Man and King could be closed. Daniel 7 recalled, and in the first century BCE was understood to recall, the mission, suffering, vindication and enthronement of God's obedient ones (Dan 7:14 LXX); and 1 Enoch, interpreting the Danielic tradition, may be thought of as part of Jewish speculation about the relation between such obedient ones and 'heavenly beings'.[219] The parallelism between 1 Enoch and Matthew 25:31 would then be striking: the judge will repay the kings of the earth 'for the wrong which they did to his children and to his chosen ones',[220] and the 'Son of Man' is both the Righteous One and the King who will be the end-time judge.[221]

That leaves the remaining problem raised by Brandenburger: the alleged shift in the implied milieu, the shift from the Christological formulations of 25:31 to the traditional apocalyptic Vision in 25:32bff. Much depends here on the definition of the 'apocalyptic' and how that term is used in relation to Mt 25:31-46. Brandenburger's use of 'apocalyptic' in relation to 25:32bff as a revelatory vision is of course justified. Its visionary outline, its narration by the heavenly judge and its division of humanity into two bear some relation to that quest for a higher wisdom through revelation which apocalypse is currently held to imply.[222] But if 'apocalyptic' is to be used of Mt 25:31-46 the other distinctive characteristics of that passage deserve appropriate expression. Via[223] provides a starting-point. He begins with the distinction between apocalypse (the literary genre), apocalyptic eschatology (a religious perspective which envisions that God's saving act will not fulfil his promises within historical and political structures but will effect deliverance out of the present historical order into a new transformed order) and apocalypticism (a symbolic world which is a specific response to a particular social situation and which is governed by the perspective of

---

219 Rowland, *Open Heaven*, 94ff.

220 See Suter, *Tradition*, 117ff, and Knibbs, *Enoch*, on 1 Enoch 62:1b.

221 Casey, *Son of Man*, 99-104; Slater, *Son of Man*, 183-198.

222 For a critical summary, see Mazzaferri, *Revelation*, 160-174.

223 Via, *Matthew 25*, 80ff.

apocalyptic eschatology). Adopting John Collins's definition of the literary genre 'apocalypse' but rejecting Adela Collins's conclusion that Matthew 24-25 should be excluded from that genre as only a related type, Via is able to use 'apocalyptic' of 25:31-46 with the single but significant proviso (drawing on Fiorenza's literary-phenomenological analysis of apocalyptic) that the paraenetic element in Christian apocalyptic includes, according to 25:31-46, the presence of the future judge here and now. The parable of *The Sheep and the Goats* is in fact concerned with various aspects of the present, dealing with both the chronological relationship of the present to the end, and the material relationship of the present to the end. The end is imminent (the chronological relationship), imminence (it will be soon) being reinterpreted as uncertainty or unexpectedness (it could be any time) but not in itself replaced by uncertainty or unexpectedness (since both portray the present as a crisis in which the future is decided); the end is judgment (the material relationship), judgment being defined in terms of its criteria (affecting how we act now; we are to love our neighbour in deed and act) and the risk involved in meeting and in not meeting the criteria now (neither the sheep nor the goats knew precisely what they were about). An interpretation of 25:31-46 therefore needs to take account of the predicament in which the reader is placed by the narrative: the reader knows what needs to be done but unknowing innocence is the only way in which it can be done. The difference between the sheep and the goats is not that one acted and the other did not. So judgment and achievement are both present and future: knowing maturity and non-calculation may only occur ultimately at the eschaton, but they are also part of actual reality now. In this way Via's classification of 'apocalyptic' enables him use the term in his analysis of 25:32-46 but it also enables him to do justice to the text's distinctive features.

This is a valuable contribution to the discussion; but Via's threefold classification of 'apocalyptic' requires two important areas of clarification. First, Collins's definition of 'apocalyptic' as a literary genre is open to question. A solution which assesses the contributions of Collins, Aune, Hanson and Rowland to the general study of the apocalyptic genre is that of Mazzaferri.[224] Mazzaferri's tighter method of analysis results in a greater emphasis on the dualism inherent in apocalyptic as a genre. Three complementary characteristics are essential for a definition: the first is a dualism in three major forms, ethical, spatial and temporal; the second is a profound pessimism about the current evil order, and hope alone in renewal; the third is a decided determinism.[225] If to that tighter definition of content is added the stricter definition of form, that the genre must be a

[224] Mazzaferri, *Revelation*, 182-185.

[225] For evidence of a non-dualistic eschatology, see Mattila, *4Q246*, 518ff.

pseudonymous writing, and the function that of passing on the news of the imminent eschaton and humankind's eternal destiny, virtually no New Testament writing can be classified as an apocalypse. Certainly Mt 25:31-46 cannot be classified as an apocalypse in genre. On one count alone this is clear: despite the strongly dualistic appearance of the dialogue with the Judge the vision cannot be described as fundamentally pessimistic about the current evil order. As Via says, Matthew holds believers and non-believers ultimately accountable to the same standard and does so on Christological grounds (if not also on theological grounds): the Son of Man is met by both in their neighbours.

If we accept that lighter definition of the apocalyptic genre, to what extent is it proper to describe 25:31-46 as a Vision Gattung? It has to be said that within the apocalyptic genre the Vision Gattung has many forms, and it is among these that we must look for a form which corresponds to 25:32-46. The forms are too many and overlap in too many respects for them to be reduced to a simple pattern. However, there are those which announce a dream, or vision or message, and often involve an interpretation; and there are those which warn of a coming judgment or of the arrival or enthronement of the Judge, who divides the righteous from the wicked (e.g. 2 Bar 29-30; 1 Enoch 62, 91). It is with this last group that 25:32-46 has close affinities: a Judgment Vision dividing and apportioning rewards, with varying emphases, such as recompense for the tyrant or paraenesis for the righteous. The affinities are recognizable; but 25:32-46 is different in its basic assumptions. It does not share the assumptions of the apocalyptic genre. Its function is not identifiable from its form. The Gattung has been profoundly redirected.

Second, the concept of 'apocalypticism' requires a more careful analysis. A symbolic world governed by dualistic perspectives in the three forms, ethical, spatial and temporal, cannot easily be accommodated to the Matthean text as a whole. The polarized pictures are there in abundance, in all three forms; but in every case they are qualified by 'mediating instances', sometimes 'from above' as in the case of the Christological factors, sometimes 'from below' as in the case of the ecclesiological.[226] So the underlying structure of Matthew's world is not that of 'apocalypticism'. Apocalypticism is where polarized notions prevail and life becomes a continuous struggle between opposite forces. That fits some of Matthew's Gospel but not all of it; and it does not fit 25:31-46.

The key issue concerning 'apocalypticism' is how apocalyptic language functions.[227] Via is right to insist on formulating what apocalyptic is about

[226] Syreeni, *Structure*.
[227] Syreeni, *Structure*, 10.

in terms of the New Testament world. It is not sufficient to translate apocalyptic imagery into the categories of theological eschatology and existential discourse, as Fiorenza has done. Some New Testament apocalyptic language functions referentially and/or imaginatively.[228] By referentially is meant the reference of language to the cosmological order; by imaginatively is meant the poetic world of metaphor. But the appropriate biblical terms of reference for interpreting 'apocalyptic' relate, as all prophetic work does, to the manifesting of the divine will in the world and the complex modes of expression by which that revelation takes place.[229] The Vision Gattung is one of those modes and it is in terms of that reference point that 25:32-46 has to be interpreted. Such a context is not only well suited to 25:32-46; it is also suggestive when applied to the other kinds of apocalyptic language present in Matthew: divine judgment (7:23), prophetic warning (11:22-24), recompense language (22:13), revealed mysteries (13:35), contrasting forces (13:11) and cataclysmic events (27:28). 'Apocalypticism' is not primarily about a symbolic order, but (like all apocalyptic language) about the manifesting of the divine will in the world.

In one sense then Brandenburger's division of 25:31a and 32-46 looks possible. 25:32-46 could be classified, as Brandenburger suggests, as a Vision Gattung, warning of the coming judgment. But in other ways his division of the text of 25:31ff is wrong. First, that very Gattung can include the arrival and enthronement of the Judge (25:31ab). Second, Brandenburger gives considerable emphasis to the redactor's role in 25:32a.[230] The purpose of this is to mark the boundary point between the introduction to and the body of the parable, so that the redactional and the traditional elements in the passage can be clearly defined. The linguistic route to that kind of judgment is always treacherous; and that is true of 25:31a. Few words illustrate the difficulty better than συναχθήσονται. The statistics of its usage in the Synoptics are open to several different interpretations,[231] but what is almost

---

[228] Via, *Matthew 25*, 89. Stanton's use of 'apocalyptic' (in *Gospel*, 223) for a 'symbolic world' function is similar.

[229] See ch.2 p.94, 102-104.

[230] Friedrich, *Gott im Bruder*, 23.

[231] συνάγω

Schenk, *Sprache*, 179f; Gundry, *Matthew*, 648; Friedrich, *Gott im Bruder*, 20.

Mt 24x:	10x No Par; 1x Par Mk; 6x Diff Mk; 2x Par Lk; 4x Diff Lk; 1x Diff Lk or No Par.
Mk 5x:	1x Par Mt; 1x Diff Mt; 3x >.
Lk 6x:	4x No Par; 2x Par Mt.

The problems in evaluating this can be seen from Friedrich, *Gott im Bruder*, 20, Gaston, *Horae Synopticae*, 82: 4x Mk Edit; 6x Matthew Edit; and Schenk, *Sprache*, 179. The issue can be stated in this form: should this be taken as evidence for editorial shaping of the narrative to depict the opposition between Jesus and his opponents, or are we dealing with a rather more subtle blend of

certainly wrong is the attempt to reconstruct sources within the parable on the basis of the two senses of συνάγω, 'gather together' in 25:32 and 'take in' 25:35,38,43.[232] These founder on the presence of both senses of συνάγω in the same type of literature, in Test Zebulun 6:4-7:2 and Test Benjamin 9:1-2, in remarkably similar contexts to Mt 25:31ff,[233] the former providing a parallel to the uses of συνάγω in 25:35,38,43 and the latter to the gathering of πάντα τὰ ἔθνη in 25:32. This is another useful way of testing out the validity of a 'consistency/inconsistency' argument. Does it hold good for other reasonably sized tracts of material?

To sum up, the parable of *The Sheep and the Goats* takes the place in Matthew's Gospel of a logion found in Mt 19:27f and Lk 20:20-22, and of that logion as formulated in a context akin to 1 Enoch and as found by Matthew in a Marcan context which had been similarly influenced. In that context the Son of Man was identified as the judge who will sit on his glorious throne, exercising kingly prerogatives. As the Son of Man, sitting in judgment, he is no other than the one who suffered, and, as the righteous one, was himself judged and rejected. Those who share that fate with him may expect vindication, and so share in his reign. Among the Matthean Son of Man sayings, 25:31 and 19:27-28 are distinctive. Mt 25:31 provides a new focus for the Son of Man material, not least in the association of the Universal Judge with the Passion Narrative. However, it is itself a piece of tradition and is not to be dissociated from 25:32 and 34. The tradition in 25:31-32a cannot be divorced from the process by which a Vision in a Warning Gattung emerged in 25:31-34; this was expanded, producing a

---

formulae suited to memorized utterance and flashbacks. Schenk's reference to Mk 7:1 Diff Mt 15:1 as the beginning of a Matthean usage of the Verb, indicating Pharisaic opposition to Jesus, raises the question: why then does Matthew change συνάγονται at that point to προσέρχονται and employ συνήχθησαν in neutral senses, e.g. at 13:2? The permutations of Prepositions raises a similar question: if opposition is so important in the use of the Verb, why is the use of ἐπὶ with συνάγω restricted to the soldiers in 27:27 and to ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό in 22:34? The opening of the Passion Narrative with συνήχθησαν, regarded by Schenk as so important, makes no attempt to relate the use of the Passive to 25:32. These considerations might hint that the second alternative mentioned above is feasible, perhaps even preferable. There is another factor, the use of συνάγω in 2:4. The kind of inclusio claimed by Schenk for 2:4 and 28:12 hangs on the inimical ('feindliche') character of the Verb. It is also suggests an oppositional theory of Matthew's Gospel, with no room for nuances of appreciation for the scribes and Pharisees. Schenk requires this strong editorial view of συνάγω by classifying it under σκορπίζω and associating it with συναγωγή. From source-critical (see 2:4; 25:24,26; 3:12; 6:26) and literary-critical points of view the classification he has chosen is prejudicial.

[232] Friedrich, *Gott im Bruder*, 21.

[233] On the text, see De Jonge, *Testaments*.

concluding parable which replaced the logion. Great care has to be exercised in claiming redactional features for individual elements in the 25:31. The phrases are on the whole traditional. This statement can stand despite the evidence of a major structural intention and plan in which the material was incorporated.

Four major questions remain: the identity of those judged, the extent of the parabolic picture, the character of the narrative, and the criterion of judgment.

1. *Who are to be judged? What is meant by* πάντα τὰ ἔθνη?

(i) *The Old Testament Evidence and Intertestamental Evidence*

Hare and Harrington conclude[234] that in Matthew's time ἔθνη would not have referred to the specific national groups (Egyptian, Greeks, etc.) which impinged upon the nation of Israel. Rather, these terms would convey the notion of that whole collective of nations (the Gentile nations) other than Israel, as well as those individual non-Jews who made up that collective. Friedrich[235] gives five cases in the LXX where ἔθνη includes the Jews. Three of these are proven: Hab 2:5; Jer 28 (LXX 35):11, and 14.

(ii) *The Matthean Uses*

Non-Israelites are referred to by the word ἔθνη in seven places. These are as follows: 4:15, 10:5b,[236] 10:18,[237] 12:18,21,[238] 20:19,25. 24:9 and 14

---

[234] Hare and Harrington, *Disciples*.

[235] Friedrich, *Gott im Bruder*, 247f.

[236] There is a tension between this command and 28:19. Trilling, *Wahre Israel*, 81f, considers the alternatives and opts for a 'historical' picture (i.e. first to the Jews, then to the Gentiles). See Beare, *Matthew*, 242; Hahn, *Mission*, 103ff; Barth, *Gesetzesverständnis*, 94ff. Lange, *Matthäus*, 250ff, prefers a picture of concentric circles of mission; Luz, *Matthäus*, 1/2 91f, having dismissed the allegorical, church-historical and limited 'Mission of the Church' explanations, cannot decide between the 'concentric' view and the view that 28:18-20 suspends 10:5b. Brown suggests an 'extension' of mission in 28:19-20 (on the basis that Jesus took no clear position (*Community*, 194), but (*Apocalypse*, 19) incorrectly supposes that judgment by 'works of mercy' is introduced in 25:35-45 because the command in 29:18-20 had not yet been given. Both Luz and Brown (also Carson, *Matthew*, 245, following Meier?) assume too massive a chasm between pre-resurrection and post-resurrection situations in Matthew. Friedrich is clear that the tension is caused by adherence to Q in 10:5b—correctly (Friedrich, *Gott im Bruder*, 251). He is also clear that (pace Luz) ἔθνη can in 28:18-20 include Jews. The retention of the Q tradition in its tension with 28:18-20 accepts the teaching of Jesus as authoritative material from the past (28:20) but, as in the ethical approach of Matthew, recognizes that the church does not to be need to be bound slavishly by it. See also van Aarde, *God-with-us*, ch. 8; and pp.403f.

[237] Trilling, *Wahre Israel*, 104-106, sees καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν extending the horizon of persecution from Jews to Gentiles. ἔθνη, according to Frankemölle,

could include Jews, and the argument of Hare and Harrington that Matthew, in altering Mark, must have wished to alter Mark's sense, betrays a very wooden approach to redactional work. It is possible that Matthew intends a distinction between ἔθνη and πάντα τὰ ἔθνη (compare 10:18 with 25:32), but this is uncertain. The phrase in 24:30 αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς (see Zech 12:10,14) indicates one of the possible alternatives.[239]

There is some patristic evidence for 28:19 as referring to Gentiles. 28:18-20 might suggest that the ἔθνη which are summoned for judgment have been evangelized (24:14) but Matthew is not suggesting there that every individual will have been evangelized. 28:18-20 is the best possible grounds for regarding πάντα τὰ ἔθνη as capable of meaning all who are to be evangelized, i.e. all non-Christians.

(iii) *The Parabolic Setting of 25:32*

The ἔθνη are divided into two groups, and these are judged by reference to a third group. Those designated 'blessed' are ultimately called δίκαιοι (vv37,46). Can the third group be identified and does this help the identification of the other two? Are the third group the Christian missionaries around the throne? Are they local Christians in need? Are they those in need, Christian or not? Are these categories mutually exclusive? Are they Jews?[240] With respect to the word ἀδελφός used of this third

---

Jahwebund, 120f, is a religious concept structured so as to provide an exposition of the relation of the church to Israel; it makes the material transparent to the present. The context of Mk 13:9-10 could however have been brought to mind by the μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς phrase (Catchpole, *Poor on Earth*, 387f).

[238] The quotation from Isa 42:1-4 draws attention to the Ninevites, on whom Jonah announced judgment (12:38f; see Cope, *Matthew*, 41), and to the Queen of Sheba, who passed judgment on Solomon (Hill, *Son and Servant*, 11). They point forward to the judgment scene, when the Son of Man will announce the Final Judgment on all the nations (for this sense of κρίσις, see Luz, *Matthäus*, 1/2 247), for the Gentiles will rise up and judge 'the present generation'. The Gentiles, or the nations, will have cause to hope on the Son of Man, since his is a justice which seeks out the weak, the despised and the helpless.

[239] Compare 24:30 with Dan 7:13.

[240] Christian, *Mt 25,31-46*, 28-36, uses the third group τούτων τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου τῶν ἐλαχίστων to clarify the redactor's view of those under judgment; he considers four possibilities (see also Gray, *Brothers*):

1) Christian missionaries assembled around the throne.

In support the following arguments are adduced:

(i) ἀδελφός can only mean 'brother Christian' in Matthew;

(ii) 'Brother' does not mean 'common humanity' in Qumran or Early Church sources;

(iii) ἐλάχιστος and μικρός mean Christians (10:42; 18:6);

(iv) Missionaries are referred to in 10:40-42, a clear parallel to 25:31ff;

(v) τούτων indicates a specific group outside that of the judged;

(vi) πάντα τὰ ἔθνη means not Christians, or the church, but the heathen;

group in v40, though not in v45, one level of reference could certainly be members of the Christian community; but, as Via says, the text refuses to stay within those limits.[241] The exclusively Christian reference may indeed have been integral to earlier levels of the tradition. At the end of the teaching section of the Gospel it would seem 'unwise' and 'inhuman' (see 5:22,23,24; 7:3,4,5), especially in view of the command to 'love your enemies!'[242] With respect to ἐλάχιστος the same applies. The restriction of the word to Christians would be unnecessary on linguistic grounds.[243]

(vii) The Son of Man appears in order to judge, along with his followers;
(viii) Acts also has a similar contrast of Christians and heathens.
See also Winandy, Cope, Broer.
Also Michaels, *Matthew 25,31-46*, with parallels from the apostolic hardships in 2 Cor 11; and Gross, *Mt 25,40*.

2) Christians in need in the congregation.
In support of this view the following arguments are adduced:
(i) 25:31ff concerns the judgment of Christians, not heathens;
(ii) ἀδελφός usually means Christian in Matthew;
(iii) Within the parable, the unity of Christ and believers is expressed as an identification (vv35-36); it is a kind of mystical union.
See also Schelkle, Cerfaux, Strecker, Schulz, Maddox, Robinson, Dupont, Pesch, M'Neile, Court, Brandt.

3) Those in need, in general.
In support of this view the following arguments are adduced:
(i) ἀδελφός and ἐλάχιστος are not decisive for the meaning of the phrase;
(ii) ἀδελφός is absent from v45, and if this word was being emphasized it would surely be there in v45;
(iii) The wide meaning of ἀδελφός corresponds to Mt 5:47;
(iv) 'Brother' has a wide range of meaning in the Beatitudes;
(v) There is nothing to indicate disciples and apostles here;
(vi) τούτων is a superfluous Demonstrative Pronoun;
(vii) 25:31ff is not an expansion of 10:40-42;
(viii) The general standard is equally applicable to all;
(ix) The view that the eternal destiny of all must depend on their treatment of Christians would be essentially immoral;
(x) πάντα τὰ ἔθνη is universal and allows no limitation.
See Schlatter, Theissing, Hare, J. Weiss.

4) An open possibility: either a or c;
Via, Fenton, Robinson, Pesch, Broer.
To these may be added:

5) Jews: Findlay, *Jesus and His Parables*, 120.
See Ladd, *Sheep and the Goats*, 191-199; Stanton, *Gospel*, ch. 9, whose argument depends on the classification of 25:31ff as apocalyptic.

[241] Via, *Matthew 25*, 92.

[242] Christian, *Mt 25,31-46*, 34ff; Piper, *Love your Enemies*, 144-151.

[243] Christian's judgment in *Mt 25,31-46*, that μικρός and ἐλάχιστος are capable in Matthew of extensions of meaning, is fully confirmed by Appendix E of Jones, *Matthew 18*. There it is argued: 1) that the Old Testament does not provide clear evidence for μικρός as a technical term (Michel's survey in *TWNT*,

The related terms suggest that Matthew was personalizing values which he takes to be of wide application.[244] This could be true also for ἐλάχιστος. It is the 'lowliest' whose needs are met, without social or religious qualification. Provided that the text is secure[245] it would seem that the linguistic evidence for the third group being Christians, and Christian only, is not strong. The strongest case for the third group being Christians might be if there is evidence that Matthew's Gospel was clearly dualistic.[246] But we have already seen that to be an insecure assumption. The contrasts do not seem to have been non-Christian/Christian but merciful/non-merciful.

649, is too brief: it does not consider the vocabulary variations in the LXX, Aquila and Symmachus, the range of Hebrew background words, the alternative word fields for 'election' (e.g. Deut 7:7 LXX) and the history of the interpretations of Zech 13:7 in the Targumim, intertestamental literature and NT); 2) in Mt 10:42; 11:11; 13:32; 18:6,10,14; 25:34 the Matthean uses of this item of vocabulary include plurisignificance (e.g. 13:32); they include 'value judgments' (as in 11:11); they represent variant basic attitudes and traditions (e.g. εἰς ὄνομα in 10:41-42 implies 'recognizing them as'; contrast that with the 'lack of recognition' central to 25:31-46); 3) Stanton's use (*Gospel*, ch. 11) of 5 Ezra and the Apocalypse of Peter to provide early evidence of a use of 'little ones' as a technical term is not supported by Werner, *ThLZ*, 1974, 577, nor by the twin contrast in Epiphanius, *Panarion* XLVIII.x.3, and the uncertainty in that text as to whether or not Montanus was dependent on Mt 13:43, nor by recent translations of 5 Ezra 1.37, nor by a careful exegesis of the first reference to 'little ones' in the Apocalypse of Peter 79.1 and strict attention to the context there.

[244] Matthew deals with concepts relating to qualities of life and of behaviour. The Matthean form of the Beatitudes illustrates this: he affirms πραΰτης and δικαιοσύνη; his Old Testament quotations concur: three times he affirms ἔλεος. Although the Gospel presents examples of these qualities, sometimes offering definitive cases (Mt 12:18-21), that is by no means always the case. 'These least' in Mt 25:40 and 45 may serve as personal illustrations, pointing to qualities of life and the action proper in relation to them. They may contextualize standards rather than providing definitive cases (pace Manék, *Mt 25,31-46*, 15-25). It is in this way that we may speak of Matthew as personalizing values, values which he recognizes to be of a very wide application.

[245] πάντα τὰ ἔθνη and the Pronoun αὐτούς rest uneasily side by side. See however Mt 13:41-42. Maddox, *Sheep and the Goats*, 19-28, suggests a full stop to separate the phrase from the Pronoun, particularly to avoid the implication of a one-by-one judgment (Maddox, 28). This is part of Maddox's solution to the problem of 25:31-46: the sheep and the goats are faithful and unfaithful leaders respectively. It does not however answer the main difficulty: why does the parable occur at the climax of the Gospel's teaching?

[246] The assumption of well-integrated terminology lies behind much literary critical discussion of 25:31-46. Wilder, *Imagery*, 229-245, argues that eschatological imagery has a polyvalent character. It reaches back into the past, quickening inherited imagery and myth, and draws 'transhistorical reality' into confrontation with the present.

A further problem with the designation of the third group is that if they are missionaries, and reception of them is the criterion of acceptance or rejection, the motif of 'not seeing Christ in them', which is an integral part of the Dialogue with the Judge in both its sections, makes little sense. The options open are: either they saw Christ in the missionaries and responded to them by receiving them, and so receive the reward of eternal life; or they did not see Christ in the missionaries and therefore did not receive them, and for this there will be the reward of eternal fire. The alternative to that is: either they saw Christ in the missionaries and responded to them by receiving them, and so receive the reward of eternal life; or they did not see Christ in the missionaries but received them nevertheless, and for this too there will be the reward of eternal life; eternal fire is only for those who did not respond in the right way, whatever the right way may mean. In either case there are problems for the simple interpretation of 25:31ff. In the first case the text of the dialogue indicates that those despatched into the fire have no recollection of not receiving the visitors. In the second case, if they did not see Christ in the missionaries but still receive the reward, then this means that τὰ ἔθνη gathered for judgment must at the very least include the non-committed, and those who receive the reward must include at the very least those who have no other claim to reward except that of receiving a disciple. The contrast with Mt 10:42 is striking: the cup of cold water is rewarded there because it is given to one associated with Christ (εἰς ὄνομα μαθητοῦ); in 25:31ff it is given without the knowledge that the recipient is associated with Christ.

If the third group is not necessarily to be identified with Christians, or not necessarily to be identified with Christians at all levels of the tradition and redaction, then this could mean that the ἔθνη are understood to include both Christians and non-Christians. It would be difficult to resist an inclusive sense for τὰ ἔθνη, i.e. Christians, Jews, Romans, Egyptians, etc., all classed together as a collective whole: i.e. 'the nations'.

(iv) *The Context of chs. 24 and 25*

In eschatological discourses it is essential to distinguish between what is actually said and what is intended or conveyed. The level of symbolism and traditional imagery is high, and the practice of reinterpretation usual. Nevertheless there are two important details in this discourse which might point to a judgment involving all the nations.[247] There is the emphasis, a strongly polemic emphasis, on the cosmic character of the Parousia and its

[247] Hahn, *Eschatologische Rede*, 110-124. Hahn takes the view that the theological significance of the redactional work of Matthew on the eschatological discourse is ultimately a warning to the Christian community. While not denying this element in Matthew's work, there are other factors also, notably the recognition of the wide range of the Father's will and purpose.

'obviousness' (24:27,30); and there is the hint in the parable of *The Talents* that God is gathering in the Gentiles (25:26a).[248]

(v) πάντα τὰ ἔθνη *and the Whole Gospel*

Decisions on the meaning of the phrase are linked with views about the redaction of the whole Gospel. According to Bornkamm, 25:31ff is a parable addressed to the community because the whole Gospel is about the breaking down of barriers before the test of love, a test to which all disciples must be submitted.[249] According to Klein there are parts of the Gospel which offer the hope of salvation on the grounds of mercy as the doing what is right, and other parts which define right and the hope of salvation differently.[250] A key issue then is whether Mt 25:31ff is to be identified wholly with a particular tradition behind Matthew, or whether such a tradition within the context of the whole Gospel serves a wider purpose in Matthew, e.g. that of bringing together discrepant versions of Christianity.

There is a particular set of assumptions at work when we make judgments on the meaning of this particular phrase. It is born of our post-Constantinian situation, which makes it hard to envisage the pre-Constantinian[251] times in which Matthew was written. It is difficult to imagine the attitudes, relationships and dynamics, particularly between Christian and non-Christian, in such a pre-Constantinian society. The question which arises today, at such a distance in time from the redaction of the Gospel, is whether we can sense the possible range of functions of a written work in such a different environment. Sociological work on the Gospel text provides some help. It helps us to see how minority groups, of which the Christian church was certainly one in pre-Constantinian times,

---

[248] See pp.476f.

[249] The force of πάντα τὰ ἔθνη is thus assessed in the light of ecclesiology, eschatology and Christology. According to the former, the boundaries of the church are, in the Last Judgment, less important than the command of the Risen Lord. He authorizes the way of the earthly Jesus, calling his followers to a discipleship consisting in obedience, humility and readiness for suffering. According to the latter, the time of Jesus as Israel's king has given way to a new time, following his death and resurrection, in which he is Lord and Judge of all nations: Bornkamm, *Der Auferstandene*, 182-185.

[250] Klein, *Frömmigkeit,* 469-470.

[251] Gewalt, *Mt 25,31-46*, 9-21, looks at the uses of ἔθνη from the point of view of sociological considerations: the self-understanding present in the parable of 25:31-46 is a 'sect-type' and Matthew's use of it moves toward a 'church-type'. He comments: 'Manche Autoren, die heute mit uns übereinstimmen, entdecken mit der Möglichkeit, die manifeste Kirche könne zu einer Minderheit oder gar Sekte schrumpfen, den Minderheitscharakter des vorkonstantinischen, speziell des matthäischen Christentums wieder' (Gewalt, 20). This opens up an important area of discussion. However, Gewalt's dismissal of tradition makes his treatment of ἔθνη open to question.

could feel threatened, could turn in on themselves, and act defensively and belligerently. Group dynamics enables us to see how groups and their leadership interact, and how leadership patterns develop in situations of uncertainty and perceived external pressures.[252] We may have texts roughly contemporary with Matthew which are caught up in or are responding to such processes. 1 Enoch may be one of these. Some argue that the form of the Enochic parable shows that the writer of 1 Enoch is attempting to lessen the group's alienation from history, using a written form to increase the readers' confidence in face of the world. Is Matthew performing a similar function for his readers?[253] That possibility is significant for the interpretation of πάντα τὰ ἔθνη.

It is possible to recognize in πάντα τὰ ἔθνη a reference to 'all nations', inclusive of Christian, Jew, Roman and Egyptian. An interesting contemporary parallel is the Pentecost Narrative in Acts, where all the national groups gathered in Jerusalem are enumerated. The parallel is even more instructive if, as seems likely, the enumeration in Acts approximates to the order of the ancient signs of the zodiac, according to which the known world was given symbolic unity and order.[254] The perception of 'the known world' presented by means of such a symbolic representation reminds us of the kind of universe in which the ancient reader lived. To sum up: there is no linguistic evidence which rules out of court an interpretation relating πάντα τὰ ἔθνη to 'all nations', and there is some evidence that favours it. If that view is considered, the interpretation of 25:32 as a world-wide judgment becomes a significant possible point of reference for the understanding of the whole Gospel, not least because it occurs within the last of the summary parables.

2. *The Extent of the Parabolic Picture*

Once 25:33 is over, the parable of *The Sheep and Goats* is effectively finished. The imagery of the shepherd dividing his flock belongs only to 25:32b-33. Only the references in v34 and v41 to the 'right' and the 'left' continue that initial picture. This might suggest that the 'shepherd' imagery is a simile:[255] the Son of Man is like a shepherd. Formal similes are rare in the Synoptics. In Matthew there are three examples of similes using ὡς,[256] which is followed by the single word of comparison, e.g. 13:43. There are two double similes:17:2 (Diff Mk) and 28:3 (No Par or Diff Mk). Two similes use ὥσπερ: 25:14, an unusual construction, where the word is taken

252 See pp.140-142.
253 Suter, *Tradition*, 164-166.
254 Haenchen, *Apostelgeschichte*, 133 Anm.3.
255 McCall, *Simile*, 223.
256 Muraoka, *Use*, 51-72.

over from Mark,[257] and 25:32. 25:32 is the only collatio in Matthew, where the sentence to be embellished and the comparison embellishing it have balancing parts. Since the metaphor ποιμήν is able to refer to a wide range of referents it is to be regarded as an 'emblematic' metaphor.

Immediately after the collatio, there follows στήσει τὰ μέν πρόβατα ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ. The simile is being continued in this phrase, as the Future tense στήσει suggests, but the vocabulary used (τὰ πρόβατα) is metaphorical. The unusual character of the verse is beginning to appear. As a formal simile it is reasonably rare in Matthew; as a collatio it is unparalleled. The simile and collatio slip into a narrative Vision using metaphorical elements.

The vocabulary of the opening of the collatio (25:32b) is also unusual. The choice of ἀφορίζω[258] rather than διαχωρίζω or διακρίνω is unexpected. So is the choice of ἀπ' ἀλλήλων.[259] The Verb has a semi-technical word field and this is a non-technical context. The main metaphor (the shepherd separating out) is vivid and powerful and offers a range of possible references. But the second part of the collatio, where the simile embellishes the statement ἀφορίσει αὐτοὺς ἀπ' ἀλλήλων, is introduced with vocabulary which is so imprecise[260] that the embellishment lacks clarity. One cannot assume that the vocabulary of the embellishment is redactional. It would be extremely difficult to argue for στήσει being editorial; the transitive forms

---

[257] See pp.463f.

[258] The LXX offers a similar construction using διακρίνω in Ez 34:17; διαχωρίζω is used in Gen 30:32; ἀφωρίζω in Isa 56:3 and Sir 47:2 is not parallel to the Matthean examples in 25:32-33. ἀφωρίζω in Acts 15:39 indicates how Barnabas and Paul separate. On the semi-philosophical use of ἀφωρίζω, see Plato, *Hp Maj*, 298d. A Matthean non-technical use of a semi-philosophical term is found in 13:49 and belongs to a late form of *The Net*; whether or not it belongs to the final redaction will be considered later.

[259] ἀλλήλων Mt 3x No Par; Mk 2x Diff Mt; 3x > Mt; Lk 6x No Par; 1x Diff Mt (τοῖς ἑτέροις); with ἀπό in Mt 25:32 and Acts 15:39 (for the distinctive Matthean use in 25:32, see Schenk, *Sprache*, 21).

[260] Friedrich, *Gott im Bruder*, 137-150, notes that various translations of πρόβατα and ἐρίφων are possible (the variants are εριφιων P^{75} and αιγων D). LXX uses ἔριφος for he-goat, although alongside 'sheep' it can mean simply 'goat' or 'young ram' (in Josephus it means 'a young kid'). πρόβατον can mean sheep, or among small livestock it can mean female animals. The reason for the separation of the animals is not clear (a nightly separation of the hardier sheep (see Carson, *Matthew*, 521); or for the milking of the female?); metaphorical interpretations are unlikely; and the parallel in 1 Enoch 89-90 cannot shed light on the problem, since it provides a different contrast. The levels of associations traditionally built upon the separation of the two groups of animals are similarly obscure: Ps Sol 17:45 has the King Messiah shepherding his flock, showing mercy on the nations who come before him in fear, and judging (διακρίνει) the peoples (17:48). On 'left/right' see n.269 below.

are very rare in the Synoptic Gospels.[261] μὲν and δέ cannot be classified as editorial, although the mistake[262] of regarding them as editorial is often

---

[261] ἵστημι pace Schenk, *Sprache*, 311; Gundry, *Matthew*, 644; Friedrich.

Mt 21x:	7x No Par	Mt 2:9; 6:5; 18:16; 20:3; 20:6(2x); 25:33.
	6x Par Mk	Mt 12:25,26; 16:28; 18:2; 20:32; 24:15.
	6x Diff Mk	Mt 12:46; 13:2; 26:15; 26:73; 27:11,47.
	1x Par Lk	Mt 4:5.
	1x Text?	Mt 12:47.
Mk 9x:	6x Par Mt; 2x Diff Mt; 1x >.	
Lk 26x:	16x No Par.	
	4x Par Mk.	
	3x Diff Mk.	
	1x Par Mt.	
	1x Diff Mk or No Par.	
	1x Text?	

Transitive forms of ἵστημι:

Mt 4x:	1x No Par	Mt 25:33 Future;
	1x Par Mk	Mt 18:2 1 Aor Active;
	1x Diff Mk	Mt 26:15 Specialized use = 'settled for';
	1x Par Lk	Mt 4:5 1 Aor Active + ἐπί;
Mk 9x:	1x Par Mt;	
Lk 1x:	1x Par Mt;	

[262] μὲν...δέ Morgenthaler, *Statistik*, 181; Kingsbury, *Parables*, 77ff; Schenk, *Sprache*, 165.

The evidence can be evaluated in various ways. This is clear from the presentation below. Kingsbury's approach to redactional use in this case is suspect: he treats *The Leaven*, which lacks the Particles, in precisely the same ways as *The Mustard Seed*, which has them, and has no means of evaluating the Marcan and Lucan evidence. Much depends on whether or not a distinction is made between current developments and redactional choice. If that distinction is made, then the pattern which emerges in the Synoptic Gospels is of the development of an enumerative use of μὲν...δέ, of a stylistic development in the presentation of contrasts, often inexactly stated, which began before Matthew, continued after, and certainly found frequent place in Matthew.

Mt 3:11	Par Lk	(Diff Mk 1:7f).
9:37	Par Lk	(Contrast: greatness of harvest/few labourers).
10:13	Diff Lk	(Contrast: part of the general heightening of a contrast between the sentence parts).
13:4	Par Mk	(But Matthew has a second contrasting Particle δὲ (13:5), which is absent from the parallel in Mark 4:5).
13:8	Diff Mk	ENUMERATIVE USE; μέν the best result.
13:23	Diff Mk	ENUMERATIVE USE (Not in Lk)
13:32	Diff Mk	(Not in Lk)
16:3	Text? or Diff Lk	

This is an interesting case, since there is a serious question as to the textual status of this verse. It may have entered the Matthean text at a post-Matthean stage. In that case we have evidence for the deliberate marking of contrasts being used in the post-Matthean stage.

made. As for the contrast ἐκ δεξιῶν...ἐξ εὐωνυμῶν, there is no evidence of its redactional use. Court's suggestion that the use here is developed from Mt 6:3 in terms of an ethic to be practised in secrecy[263] is less likely than

	16:14	Diff Mk ENUMERATIVE USE (not in Lk).
	17:11	Par Mk Again Matthew has the second Particle δέ, absent in Mark. The contrast is inexactly stated.
	20:23	Diff Mk Mark lacks μέν; Mt and Mk have δέ at the beginning of the second part (Mt 20:23b/Mk 10:40).
	21:34	Diff Mk ENUMERATIVE USE.
	22:5	Diff Lk ENUMERATIVE USE.
	22:8	Diff Lk or No Par An example where the Particles draw attention to features which are to be contrasted rather than marking the precise contrast itself.
	23:27	No Par Precise contrast: inside/outside.
	23:28	No Par Precise contrast: inside/outside. Luke's parallel passages lack μέν/δέ.
	25:15	Diff Lk ENUMERATIVE USE.
	25:33	No Par Precise double contrast.
	26:24	Par Mk Luke has πλήν not δέ in the second part.
	26:41	Par Mk Precise double contrast.
Mk	5x:	Par Mt 4:4; 9:12; 12:5; 14:21; 14:38; 16:19. 1x Text?
Lk	3:16	Par Mt or Diff Mk; see Mt 3:11 above.
	3:18	No Par πολλὰ μὲν οὖν καὶ ἕτερα.
	8:5	Par Mk.
	10:2	Par Mt.
	11:48	Diff Mt. Luke repeats the opening phrase of the explanation of the Woe, with the addition of these contrast Particles. Matthew lacks the precise contrast and the Particles.
	13:9	No Par. Contrasting protases.
	22:23	Par Mk See Mt 26:24 above.
	23:33	Diff Mk ὃν μὲν ἐκ δεξιῶν ὃν μὲν ἐξ ἀριστερῶν. ENUMERATIVE USE; absent from Mark and Matthew.
	23:41	No Par. Precise contrast.
	23:56	No Par. Precise contrast.

[263] See Court, *Right and Left*. A discriminating understanding, which distinguishes those travelling teachers who are genuinely 'coming in the name of the Lord' (Didache 12:1; Apostolic Constitution 7:28) and those who are not, cannot be in question in 25:31-46, where neither the 'sheep' nor the 'goat' recognizes the true identity of the traveller. From that point of view neither has a 'discriminating understanding'. In 25:31-46 it is a matter of some degree of ignorance. In Mt 6:3 the difference between right and left concerns the making of outward fuss and the seeking of a reputation for charity; it is not a question of ignorance. The one who gives appears to know both what must be done, and how and why it must be done. Didache 12:1 seems to make the link between visiting teachers and right and left in a quite different sense from that used in Mt 25:31ff.

his theory of an influence from III Kgs 22:19. The pagan parallels also deserve some attention.[264] The main metaphor, once established, affects the ensuing text. The 'emblematic' metaphor of the shepherd points forward to the use of πρόβατα in v33; it picks up the reference to the judging of the nations (see Ps Sol 17:45-48); and it generates the associated fields of πρόβατα, ἐρίφιον, ἐλάχιστος and ἀσθενής. In doing so, it calls to mind (as 25:31 did) the parallel in 1 Enoch, with its lengthy vision of sheep and rams, its shifting epithets for the main actor,[265] and its concern with judgment.

The answer to the question regarding the parabolic picture is therefore a surprising one. It seems that the parable has grown from 25:31f; it has no exclusively Semitic origin (its emblematic metaphor is certainly not exclusively Semitic). It appears to have been formed outside Matthew's constructional and linguistic patterns. It looks as if, when Matthew moved the logion 19:27f/Lk 22:20 from its association with *The Talents* into its present position in a Marcan context, the final redactor was already equipped with the material necessary to construct an alternative judgment passage as a final parable for the discourse and as a final parable for the Matthean teaching material.[266]

3. *What is the Character of the Fictional Narrative?*

To a certain extent the discussion of this depends on the connection assumed between 25:31-3 and 34ff.[267] There are strong signs of non-Matthean material in v34. As far as the link passages are concerned, ἐρεῖ[268] in the

---

Either this different sense is due to an association prior to Matthew's Gospel, in which 'right' and 'left' indicate discrimination, and which may or may not be linked with an early form of the Mt 25:31ff parable, or it is due to a subsequent association, which may or may not be linked to a particular reading of Mt 25:31ff. What cannot be claimed is a direct association of Didache 12 with Mt 25:31ff as Matthew presents it.

[264] Vergil, *Aen* 6:540-543; Plato, *Rep* 10.614c. See also Bligh, *Mt 25:41,46*, 137-142.

[265] The Similitudes of Enoch constantly shift from one epithet for the judge to another. Mt 25:31f has this on a much smaller scale.

[266] See ch.4 p.240.

[267] Broer, *Gericht*, 273ff.

[268] The forms from this root are found as follows:

Mt 30x:	21x No Par; 2x Par Mk; 5x Diff Mk; 2x Diff Lk
Mk 2x:	2x Par Mt
Lk 19x:	10x No Par; 3x Diff Mk; 5x Diff Mt; 1x Text?

This suggests a degree of interchange between the Synoptic Gospels, such as we find also in the case of λέγω. On λέγω, see p.234. The unusual feature of 25:34 is the word order. The word order in sentences beginning with τότε [τ] and λέγω [λ] is as follows, indicating subject with [s] and indirect object with [i]: [τλis] or

primary link position and δεῦτε[269] at the opening of the conversation leave us with the possibility that the bridge over into the dialogue may not be the

---

[τλi]. 25:34 is by contrast [τλsi], with 25:44 as a parallel (see by contrast 25:37,45). For the normal order (all examples of [τλis] are italicized), see:

4:10; 9:6 (see Mk 2:10); 9:37; 12:13 (see Mk 3:5); 22:8; *26:31*; 26:38; *26:52*; *27:13*; *28:10*. Slightly different is 15:12 [τπsλi]. Particularly interesting is the cluster of [τλis] following 25:34 in the Matthean Passion Narrative, suggesting that once a pattern is used the Passion Narrative picks it up.

[269] The two Imperatives are important evidence for this:

(i) δεῦτε Schenk, *Sprache*, 175; Gundry, *Matthew*, 643.

Mt 6x:	2x No Par	(Mt 11:28 with Paratactic Future).
	2x Par Mk	(see Mk below).
	1x Diff Mk	(δεῦτε ἴδετε).
	1x Diff Lk	(ἔρχεσθε. For δεῦτε in this context Rev 19:17).
Mk 3x:	2x Par Mt	(Mk 1:17 δεῦτε ὀπίσω; Mk 12:7 δεῦτε ἀποκτείνωμεν);
	1x >	(Mk 6:31 δεῦτε...καὶ ἀναπαύσασθε).

Others 3x.

In 25:34 δεῦτε is followed by an Attributive Participle and an Anarthrous Aorist Imperative. Both of these are found in the LXX, the latter frequently. The former is found in Mt 11:28 and the latter in Mt 28:6 (Diff Mk) with ἴδετε (Diff Mk ἴδε). Jn 4:29 provides an equivalent to the latter (see also Jn 21:12).

(ii) πορεύεσθε (Text υπαγετε 1424)

Schenk, *Sprache*, 417; Gundry, *Matthew*, 647; Gaston, *Horae Synopticae*, 80.

πορεύομαι

Mt	29x:	13x No Par; 7x Diff Mk; 5x Par Lk; 2x Diff Lk
		1x No Par or Diff Mk; 1x Text?
Mk		4x: 4x Text?
Lk	51x:	33x No Par; 10x Diff Mk; 5x Par Mt; 1x Diff Mt
		1x No Par or Diff Mt; 1x No Par or Diff Mk

πορεύεσθε

Mt	5x:	3x No Par (Mt 10:6; 25:9; 25:41)
		1x Diff Mk (Mt 21:2; Diff Mk 11:2 ὑπάγετε)
		1x Diff Lk (Mt 22:9)

Acts 5:20.

The Imperative Singular appears:

Aorist:	Mt 1x:	1x Par Lk; Lk 1x: 1x Par Mt; Acts 3x
Present:	Lk 5x:	3x No Par; 2x Diff Mk; Jn 3x; Acts 6x

There is a tendency in Matthew toward the 2nd Plural Present Imperative, and in Luke toward the 2nd Singular Present Imperative. The breakdown of the above variants suggests that the use of πορεύομαι is part of a traditional language system:

Mt	7x	Diff Mk:	2x Diff -ερχομαι; 3x Diff -πορευομαι; 2x Diff ὑπάγω
	2x	Diff Lk:	2x Diff -ερχομαι
Lk	4x	Diff Mk:	1x Diff -ερχομαι;1x Diff -πορευομαι; 2x Diff ὑπάγω
	1x	Diff Mt:	1x Diff Mt (Mt 25:14 ἀποδημῶν)

The Prepositions appearing with πορεύομαι in Matthew are:

διὰ 1x; εἰς 5x; πρὸς 3x; ἐπι 1x; ἀπό 2x. Detail of πορεύομαι + ἀπό:

Mt 2x:	1x Diff Mk (Mt 24:1); 1x No Par (Mt 25:41)
Lk 3x:	1x Diff Mk (Lk 4:42); 2x No Par (16:30; 17:19)

work of the editor. The key feature of the narrative conversation which follows in 25:34ff is the way the sections balance: 25:34-36 balances 25:41-43 phrase for phrase. Another feature of the narrative conversation is the similarity of 25:35-36 to Test Joseph 1:5-7: similar emphases, examples, patterns of vocabulary, phrase and sentence length, rhythmical forms and style are found in both. In the second half of the conversation (25:37-40; 25:44-46) there are again balancing sections; and again, during the repetition, the tendency is to shorten. Variation on repetition is characteristic of narrative parables. The variations stimulate interest, as does change in vocabulary, as διηκονήσαμεν indicates[270] at the end of the conversation (25:34). The rhythmic interest[271] again is strong, as it is in vv32-33.

This is a Greek pattern of narrative. It is continuous with vv32-33, beautifully constructed, with elegant rhythms and well-timed variations, especially in the final alteration in 25:34. The alliterations are striking and very frequent. It is traditional material but cannot entirely be dissociated from the work of the final redactor. In the conversations there are strong Matthean elements, especially in vv34, 40, 41, 45 and 46. The narrative uses 'flashbacks', and the imagery strengthens the impression that this is intended as a literary climax.

4. *What is the Criterion of Judgment?*

Catchpole[272] notes that the six typical acts of kindness in 25:31ff belong to a deeply rooted tradition evidenced in and binding together Jewish and non-Jewish material.

(i) Feeding the hungry

This responsibility spans Oriental societies in antiquity,[273] became a centre of popular Stoic philosophy (Cum esuriente panem suum dividat),[274] was found in moral fables,[275] and in Jewish writings took the form 'Feed your enemy if he hungers'.[276] To do this was a feature of ἁπλότης (Test Issachar 3.8); it was a form of fulfilling the Law of God (Test Issachar 5:1; 7:5). Care for the hungry was for Ignatius a test of religion, a test which his opponents failed (Ignatius *Smyr* 6:2).

---

270 Cranfield, *Diakonia*, 275ff.
271 Burney, *St Matthew XXV*, 31-46.
272 Catchpole, *Poor on Earth*, 389ff.
273 Goppelt, *TDNT*, 6.13.
274 Seneca, *Ad Luc*, 95.51.
275 Babrius, 46.
276 Prov 25:21.

(ii) Giving the thirsty a drink

Behm quotes the following sources:[277] the Egyptian Book of the Dead, 125: "I have pleased God by something which He loves: I have given bread to the hungry and water to the thirsty"; M Ex 14:19: "The son was hungry; the father gave him to eat; he was thirsty, and he gave him to drink." Honoured, even when it was resented (Babrius, 141:4), such care was enshrined in proverbs (Rom 12:20; Prov 25:21).

(iii) Taking the stranger in

Hospitality marked ancient literature with an often religious concern for the stranger.[278] The motives for this could be mixed: Cicero, *De Officiis* 2:18(64). But in both classical and Jewish–Christian literature hospitality was approved of and taught (Babrius 106). Openness of hospitality was encouraged (Test Zebulun 6.4)[279] both at personal and institutional[280] levels. Its practice in early Christianity and the motives for it have been fully researched, with specific reference to the interpretation of Mt 25:35-40 in the Early Church, and particularly in the work of Chrysostom.[281] The motivation included Christological, eschatological and anthropological elements.[282]

(iv) Clothing the naked

The passage quoted above from the Testament of Zebulun has significant connections of vocabulary with Mt 25:31ff. The connection is made between clothing the naked and the two Verbs σπλαγχνίζομαι and ἐλεάω. There is the Adverb ἀδιακρίτως; and the motivation: ἐξ ὧν ὁ θεὸς παρέχει. In Tobit 1:16 and 4:16, as Catchpole comments,[283] the associations of the action are ἐλεημοσύνη, δικαιοσύνη and ἀγαθοποιΐα.

(v) Visiting the sick

The overcoming of the fear of sickness[284] in the ancient world was an important social factor. It made possible a fresh awareness of the sick person's needs (Babrius 121 presents the humorous side of this).[285] There is evidence of sick-visiting societies (Gen R 13:16) and of great personal sacrifice in caring for the sick (Pliny, *Letters*, 7.19). God is referred to as the 'visitor of the sick' (Test Joseph 1:4-7; Gen R 8:13), without the consequence being drawn that there is a related human responsibility. The

---

277 Behm, *TDNT*, 2.226.
278 Goppelt, *TDNT*, 5.18ff.
279 See p.249.
280 Pliny, *Letters*, 8.8.
281 Puzicha, *Christus Peregrinus*, 11ff.
282 Puzicha, *Christus Peregrinus*, Part 2, especially 67.
283 Catchpole, *Poor on Earth*, 390.
284 Bowker, *Suffering*, chs. 1-2.
285 See also Lev R 34.1; SS R II.16 §2.

response of divine mercy to those merciful to the sick is clearly stated (Lev R 34:1).

(vi) Going to the prisoner [286]

The first expression used here, ἤλθατε πρός με (see Test Joseph 1:6), may suggest, as in the parable in Lev R 14:2, that 'someone comes and releases him and takes him out from there'. If so, the activity commended might be illustrated from a wealth of legal defences offered for the innocent (Pliny, *Letters*, 7:6) and the helpless (Cicero, *De Officiis*, II 24 (85)).

From these six examples it is evident that the standard of judgment in 25:31-46 is recognizable as of universal validity. That would have been true in Matthew's day. What is taught here was taught in the schools, by philosophers, politicians, rabbis and jurists. The standard of judgment was also related to ideals of living, some recognizably similar or even identical with the ethical vocabulary in Matthew's Gospel. The motivation behind the actions advocated was variable, and where the motivation was systematically examined, humanitarian as well as religious grounds were recognized. To this extent recent studies of Matthew which have distinguished the traditions of secular teaching from kerygmatic moral teaching[287] may not meet the mind of Matthew. An association of humanitarian and kerygmatic concerns in the discussion of ethical behaviour could be part of early Christian propaganda, teaching and preaching. That is evident from Justin and could have been the case also in Matthew.

A connection must now be made between the universal validity of the criteria in 25:31ff and the matter considered earlier, the universal character of the judgment. There is little doubt that Matthew wished to avoid a view of the final judgment which assumed that before the judgment throne those in the church were safe and all others were not, that all were judged and condemned apart from consideration of moral and ethical issues. There is little doubt that Matthew wished to focus on the Christian church the light of a judgment no less fierce than that which which faced all their contemporaries. What better way of achieving both ends than to provide common criteria for both. Moreover 25:31-46 does more than establish common criteria. It assumes a knowledge of the criteria. All are conversant with them. They know what is expected of them, and that is true whether they are sheep or goats, whether they are inside the church or outside the church, whether they are Jews or Gentiles. The judgment can be universal because the criteria of judgment are known by all.

Given a connection between the universal validity of the criteria and the universal character of the Final Judgment, how would Matthew have

---

286 Bertram, *TDNT*, 244.

287 Piper, *Love your Enemies*, 141f.

understood the relationship between judgment and the Son of Man (24:31)? Via is cautious on this point: 'Non-disciples are responsible to the norm of love, not because all human beings as human beings have been given an effective primordial revelation, but because as human beings the Son of Man is present in the poor in specific concrete situations in such as way as to evoke from the nations the capacity to transcend self-interest and act for the oppressed.'[288] This would establish a strongly Christological basis for Matthean ethics. It would also modify any impression that 'salvation is by works'. It is the grace of the Son of Man which evokes right action.

One need not doubt either contention. The Christological and the eschatological justification of ethics in Matthew are well supported in both primary and secondary sources. But to regard Matthew's ethics as only Christologically and not also theologically motivated is to assume for Matthew an anachronistic precision. A theological motivation is certainly possible according to the Sermon on the Mount (5:45). A precise theoretical distinction between Christologically and theologically based ethics would not have seemed necessary. It might of course be argued that the Early Church was intent primarily on drawing lines between the ἐκκλησία and external society. That undoubtedly made Christological considerations extremely important. It did so for many parts of the New Testament. But was Matthew at one with other parts of the New Testament on that issue? Might that not be an assumption which needs to be tested?

There might of course be Christological advantage in arguing that what Christ proclaimed as the will of the Father was also recognizably in tune with the most widely regarded human ideals. If Matthew did not make a precise theological/Christological distinction regarding the justification for right behaviour, he could perhaps have claimed for Jesus Christ an authority based on the moral law as well as that based on the Jewish law. His authority could be recognized by the rabbi and the teacher, and the centurion. It would have meant the capturing of ethical idealism for Christian commitment and service.

But before the question about Matthew's justification of Christian ethics can be answered, there is a further puzzle regarding the text which needs a solution. The text is highly ambiguous at a crucial point. The criteria are clear; but how they are to be applied depends on an ambiguous phrase. Is it simply that the sheep have given service to their neighbours and the goats did not? Are the criteria applied in that way: knowing them is not enough; it is putting them into practice that counts? Via sees a difficulty in this. The text does not make clear that the failure of the goats consisted in a failure to act. In the second part of conversation the goats reply (25:44): πότε σε

[288] Via, *Matthew 25*, 94.

εἴδομεν πεινῶντα ἢ διψῶντα ἢ ξένον ἢ γυμνον ἢ ἀσθενῆ ἢ ἐν φυλακῇ καὶ οὐ διηκονήσαμέν σοι; 25:44 could of course be taken to mean that at no point had they served the needy: they had failed in practice to meet the standards of mercy. But the question is ambiguous; the emphasis could be elsewhere. The text could mean: of course they had served the needs of those who were hungry and thirsty; on what occasion then had they failed so as to leave the Son of Man hungry or thirsty? Whichever of the two interpretations is assumed, the reader is left with a good deal of work to do. If the first is assumed, that at no point had they served the needy, why is the question framed in terms of failing to serve the Son of Man? If the second interpretation is assumed, the reader has to find a reason for the rejection, the eternal rejection, of the goats.

The reader of Matthew's Gospel would by this stage be well prepared to handle such an ambiguity. In the parable of *The Unforgiving Servant* the reader had already met a discursive response to a straightforward question. There a hint of an answer was offered for reflection: forgiveness is not enough; it has to be forgiveness 'from the heart'. Perhaps the reader of *The Sheep and the Goats* is expected to react similarly; what is required, above all, is careful reflection.

The problem in 25:31ff is further complicated by a common factor in the reactions of the sheep and the goats. As far as recognizing the presence of the Son of Man was concerned, they both failed. Neither had recognized him. Does this perhaps confirm that there must have been some hidden difference between the two groups, some difference of motivation or attitude which caused the one to be blessed and the other cursed? There have been many different explanations of this common factor. They can be discussed in terms of whether or not the needy were missionaries and whether they were recognizable. In that case the issue becomes not one of recognizing the presence of the Son of Man but one of recognizing the status of the missionaries. Court suggests that we should understand the text in that way: the hungry and the needy are Christian missionaries representing Christ, but not part of a well-organized mission from an established church.[289] The righteous and the unrighteous would be as surprised at being held accountable for their reaction to these missionaries as we might be to find ourselves judged by our behaviour to Jehovah's Witnesses in our modern multi-faith society; those who are Christian missionaries today may well be conscious of an authenticating commission; those who do or do not receive them could well be bewildered by the multitude of religions they hear, and fail to recognize any of them as having ultimate authority. That might have been the problem addressed in Mt 25:31ff. The surprise which Matthew 25

[289] Court, *Right and Left*, 231; Via, *Matthew 25*, 97.

has in store for the reader is that the pagan world might actually have formed a relationship with Jesus through their acts of love toward these, the 'least' of his followers. As Via notes, Court is assuming that although the missionaries were disciples they were not recognized as disciples. Which means, as Via correctly maintains, that the sheep must have shown acts of love toward their visitors not because they recognized them as disciples but out of human kindness.[290] They did so because their visitors were human beings in need. That is why they inherited eternal life. We are back to a picture of caring love expected from all for all, and a judgment pronounced according to the actual demonstration of that love or the failure to demonstrate it.

As Klein has suggested in relation to Mt 25:31ff, that kind of judgment by works is curiously out of step with attitudes commended in some other sections of Matthew. Other sections set different priorities or establish different emphases in defining Christian responsibility. Moreover Mt 25:31ff not merely presents criteria for judgment, but exclusive, overriding criteria for judgment. The criteria decide our eternal fate.

We have therefore a number of problems. We have an ambiguity in the text at a very crucial point (25:44): we are not sure if the goats had usually served their neighbours' needs and had only failed on one or two occasions, or whether they had consistently and entirely failed to do so. We have an unexplained factor in the insistence on the presence of the Son of Man, a presence unrecognized by any of the participants. We have unresolved tensions with material elsewhere in Matthew. In an apparently vital area of Christian understanding, on which our eternal fate depends, a central ambiguity remains.

Via's solution hinges on a parallel from drama. We must recognize the position of the reader who follows the drama and knows more than the participants in the drama.[291] Like the reader of Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* who

---

290 Via, *Matthew 25*, 93.

291 Via, *Matthew 25*, 96-97. Via is particularly concerned with the grace which makes possible the response 'In Matthew the divine is involved in the ethical achievement of the saved' (Via, *Matthew 25*, 96). For a similar approach, see Petzoldt, *Gleichnisse*, 72-77, who distinguishes the original pre-Matthean parable, with its requirement of mercy, from Matthew's concern to hold open the question of how God is 'mitten in unserem Leben jenseitig (Bonhoeffer)'. 'Nicht der erzwungene Dienst am Nächsten bewirkt diese Entdeckung, sondern die gelassene Offenheit den Aufgaben und Nöten unserer Welt' (76-77). From a different standpoint Rahner's treatment of Mt 25:31-46 rests on his exposition of the hiddenness of decision (see *Foundations of Christian Faith*, 101): 'We can never point by ourselves with certainty to a definite point in our lives and say: precisely here and not somewhere else a really radical "yes" or "no" to God took place.' See also Gnilka, *Matthäus*, 378-379; Rahner, *Theological Investigations*, 19.

knows what will happen and hears the menace in Clytemnestra's speech of welcome to her husband and shudders as the scarlet carpet is unrolled, the reader of Mt 25:31f knows more than the participants in the Final Judgment. Thus the reader is placed in a situation of tension. He or she is called on to fulfil, as the sheep did, the principle of non-calculating love. We are not to let our left hand know what our right hand is doing. But the reader also knows what the sheep did not; the reader knows the real character of brother and sister. The reader does not know how that brother or sister will be judged (13:30). But he or she does know that the Son of Man is present in them. The reader is therefore being called to be as 'ethical' as the sheep, but cannot be as 'innocent'. We are to act at our own risk for the good of others without calculating rewards; but we act in the knowledge that the transcendent is in fact present in them. Can anyone be as non-calculating, as lacking in self-interest as that? The Matthean drama asks that question and offers that blend of understanding maturity and selfless non-calculation as a genuine possibility now, in the now of the realized eschaton, as well as a quality given and achieved only ultimately in the future, at the future eschaton.

This is to credit Matthew with great subtlety of mind and understanding. Perhaps Via is correct in that. At least that is perhaps to err on the right side. So often interpreters have berated Matthew for crass and vindictive moralizing, whereas our work has shown the Gospel to be thoughtful and responsible. A more positive view of Matthew's ethical understanding at least deserves exploration. It does seem possible that part of the solution to these problems lies in the function of the fictional narrative. To take the ending as an example: it is surely correct for a modern scholar writing on the subject of Judgment in the New Testament to distinguish between a proclamation of judgment and a parable of judgment. The distinction is not easily defined: sometimes the parable will be virtually a mashal confronting the hearer with the certainty of disaster, at other times it can be a challenge to new life, though couched in terms of hell-fire.

(iv) *Its Distinctiveness within the History of Parables*

The position of *The Sheep and the Goats* helps to suggest its place within that compass. It is the last piece of teaching in Matthew, and Matthew must have seen it primarily as 'Gospel'. Otherwise presumably Matthew would not have given it pride of place at the end of the final discourse. To that extent Via is correct. A Christian response to the challenge of the Gospel is a genuine possibility now. Via is also correct that our response evolves from a confrontation with the text, with its promise of the presence of the Son of Man in need and helplessness, and with the stark alternatives of reward and punishment. Via may also be right that the narrative is framed in

such a way as to touch our certainties with nagging question marks. Whether Matthew would have seen this concluding narrative with the eyes of a classical dramatist, playing on his readers having greater knowledge than the participants, is not quite so clear. Perhaps the detail within the narrative is more the result of putting traditional material together than of a classical dramatist's touch.

That leaves the question which Klein raised. The parable of *The Sheep and the Goats* has all the signs of climactic literary intention. The writer drew from traditions parallel to those of 1 Enoch, replacing the Son of Man logion Mt 19:27f/Lk 22:20. To take its place Matthew produced a fictional narrative, concluding the eschatological discourse, the fifth and last of the five great discourses. The writer used collatio, metaphor, alliteration, metrical interest, balance and variation. The writer used the schema of a Warning Vision with its magnificent central conversation. In the Vision were presented as central and decisive universally valid criteria, acceptable and recognized across the ancient civilizations. From these elements a fictional narrative was created which contains puzzling and ambiguous elements, provocative and startling challenges. But perhaps Matthew did more than that. Perhaps, even more significantly than Klein has suggested, Matthew took the tradition of 'salvation by works', and incorporated that tradition in a narrative which was linked with the Passion Narrative, and which was capable of providing a frame for all the traditions of Christ's teaching available to him. To what extent the frame was the product of a sharp theological perception of the issues, theological, ecclesiological, Christological, or an intuitive perception of relationships within the material, is not clear.

(v) *The Parable and its Place in Matthean Redaction*

It might be argued that the claims made for 25:31ff are too great to be sustained in a historical perspective. When early Christian thinking can be seen to be groping in the primary stages of theological and ethical enquiry, could Mt 25:31ff represent so advanced a project? An integration of the available material, never mind the assimilation of current theological ideas, seems far-fetched enough. But before the latter claims are dismissed out of hand, it has to be remembered that it was Mt 25:31f that provided no less a theologian than Chrysostom, working in Syrian Antioch, with the main impulses for his theological system.[292] Not the least significant of the areas worked at by Chrysostom was this inference: if the 'least' are the hungry and poor of the world, and Jesus the Judge is recognized as one with

[292] Brändle, *Matth 25*, 41-46.

them, then service to the hungry and the poor has a Christological basis. This became Chrysostom's leading motif:

> Die bedeutendste und am direktesten auf Matth 25:31-46 bezogene Leitidee ist die der Passio und Redemptio continuata. Sie bildet das eigentliche Proprium der Auslegung des Chrysostomos das bei keinem anderen Vater der griechischen Kirche zu belegen ist. Zentrum seiner von Matth. 25,31-46 geformten Aussagen ist die Überzeugung, daß der Auferstandene sein Erlösungswerk in der Gegenwart fortsetzt. Er ist heute als Hungernder und Dürstender unter uns, weil er nach unserem Heil hungert und dürstet. Er ist heute als leidender Mensch unter uns, weil er alle Menschen zur Offenheit füreinander, zur Barmherzigkeit, zum wahren Menschsein führen will.[293]

That is not to say that this represents Matthew's own position. But it indicates how Matthew's work stimulated a theologian of a later generation to make sense of Christ's identification of himself with the poor of the world theologically and Christologically. Chrysostom's thought is part of the extensive *Wirkungsgeschichte* of Mt 25:31ff.

If Matthew created this Warning Vision from traditional material as the concluding parable of the fifth discourse, it is interesting to enquire how 25:31ff relates to the Gospel structure with its five discourses and to other concluding parables. 25:31ff balances the Beatitudes and the opening logia of the Sermon on the Mount (especially 5:13-16): those who hear are to be light for the world; all should see their good works and glorify our Father in Heaven. The parable of *The Two Houses* summarized within the teaching of Jesus' wisdom from biblical and secular sources, interpreted by God's Son, thus endorsing the universal authority of the teacher and the decisive character of the Son's revelation.

But it is in relation to the Passion Narrative that the full significance of 25:31ff can be grasped. The proximity of the Passion Narrative enabled the Son of Man once more to be seen as the one who suffers. The one who will judge was himself unjustly judged. So 25:31ff anticipates the thrust of the Great Commission in 28:18-20, with its emphasis on the Jesus of the past as the Lord of the present and the future, going with his disciples in their mission to all nations. The parable of *The Sheep and the Goats* can be seen as distinctive among the summary parables. It is a summary par excellence, holding together as a narrative fiction many elements which have been presented within the structure of the Gospel as a whole, and particularly within the pattern of the four concluding parables.

---

293 Brändle, *Matth 25*, 344.

E. *The Children's Games* Mt 11:16-19

Few parables in the Synoptic Gospels conclude discourses. In addition to the four already examined, the three other possible texts are 11:16-19, 12:43-45 and 18:14-15. Bultmann treats the first of these as the conclusion of a scholastic apothegm.[294] The pericope of the Baptist's question (Mt 11:2-6/Lk 7:18-23), followed by Christ's testimony to the Baptist (Mt 11:7-11/Lk 7:24-28), leads to the parable of *The Children's Games*, its interpretative logion in Mt 11:18f/Lk 7:33f, and to the Wisdom saying in Mt 11:19c/Lk 7:25. The apothegm as a whole concerns John the Baptist and Jesus.

It is usual to treat the extended section 11:1-19 as interpreted by means of the apothegmatic Wisdom saying Mt 11:19c/Lk 7:25; Luke's ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς[295] approves Wisdom's envoys on the grounds[296] of those who accept their message, and Matthew's ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῆς[297] identifies Jesus' works of healing as those of Wisdom herself.[298] But this is to oversimplify the complicated textual[299] and traditio-historical character of this passage.[300] In the case of the Matthean Wisdom apothegm it is possible that it is pre-Matthean in its present form, for the following reasons: 1) If the exclusive identification of Jesus' works with Wisdom's is the contribution of Matthew, then should Matthew not have been more careful to distinguish the disciples' works in 10:8 from Wisdom's, since the latter are (Diff Lk 9:1-5) parallel to Jesus' own (11:5)? Would Matthew not have noticed that this further identification would be destructive of any Christological claim implied in 11:2?[301] 2) If on the other hand the identification of Jesus' works with Wisdom's was already a part of the Matthean Q tradition, then the Q Wisdom apothegm would already have had a natural reference to 11:7-11, that is, to John's works as well as Jesus'; ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῆς would already have meant what it does in the final Matthean form: 'by Wisdom's works in the variety of their expression

---

294 Bultmann, *Geschichte*, 22.

295 On the addition παντων, see Metzger, *Commentary*, 30.

296 See Marshall, *Luke*, 303-304.

297 Linton, *Children's Game*, 167ff.

298 Dunn, *Christology*, 174ff.

299 Linton, *Children's Game*, 167ff.

300 Luz, *Matthäus*, 1/2 182-190; Verseput, *Rejection*; Deutsch, *Wisdom*; Schönle, *Johannes*; Cotter, *Children*, 290-292. The issue of Matthean redactional work cannot satisfactorily be answered in relation to the language and style of this parable. Opposite judgments are registered in Luz, *Matthäus*, 1/2 184, and Cotter, *Children*, 292-293.

301 Künzel, *Studien*, 82ff.

through John and Jesus'.[302] 3) The parallel between John and Jesus was probably a part of the Q tradition. The half verse which would disturb that parallelism, Mt 11:11b/Lk 7:28b, was almost certainly qualified in some earlier traditions, as Lk 7:29-30 suggests. The additions between 11:7-11 and 11:16-19 have the further effect of modifying the phrase in Mt 11:11b: ὁ μικρότερος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν μείζων αὐτοῦ depreciates the position of John; 11:12-14 reinstates him.[303]

If the present text and position of Mt 11:19c were pre-Matthean, this would allow the following traditio-historical hypothesis. The Q stratum which Matthew shares with Luke stressed the continuity of the work of John the Baptist and Jesus as envoys of Wisdom (see Lk 11:29-30 and Mt 21:32). A pre-Matthean editing of Q modified this in favour of a unique Christological position for Jesus (11:19c meaning 'mighty works', as in 11:2). This was reversed by the addition of a distinctive form of 11:12-15 and the Woes of 11:20-24; these were related to vv1-14 through their double references to works of power and the Day of Judgment. Thus in the final form of the Gospel the modification of John's position in 11:11b is only a qualification in one respect of John's status; that in the Kingdom honour belongs to those who realize the Kingdom's values in their own lives. Since (11:12-14) John has done this par excellence, he lays claim to the succession of Wisdom's envoys as few can, although of course he remains in the position of an Elijah.[304] The significance of this reversal in Matthew's final editing work will be seen at a later stage.

The parable of *The Children's Games* is complicated by textual and structural problems. These concern the extent of the parallelism between vv16f and vv18f[305] and the unexpected features in the order of words in v17 and v18.[306] It is further complicated by the language of the parable, especially the words καθημένοις, ἀγοραῖς and προσφωνοῦντα.[307] There is also the appearance of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in 11:19,[308] with what appears to be a reference to the Son of Man which is decisively present.

A curious feature of the parable and its context is the high density of possible Aesopian allusions in Matthew 11:7-19. Flusser offers a considerable list: the Aesopian associations with Herod Antipas, which

---

302 Meier, *John the Baptist*, 383-405; see also ch.3 p.111.

303 See Theissen, *Lokalkolorit*, 26-61; on 11:12, see Sand, *Gesetz*, 181; Green, *Matthew*, 116; Barnett, *Biastai*; Moore, *Cognates*; Cameron, *Violence*.

304 On 11:14, see Faierstein, *Elijah*, 75-86; Allison, *Elijah*, 256-258; Fitzmyer, *More About Elijah*, 295-296; Robinson, *Elijah*.

305 Linton, *Children's Game*, 171ff.

306 Zeller, *Bildlogik*, 252ff; Mussner, *Kairos*; *Children's Game*, 167ff.

307 Cotter, *Children*, 296-303.

308 Casey, *Son of Man*, 236; Lindars, *Jesus Son of Man*, 32-34; pace Luz, *Matthäus*, 1/2 187.

suggest the picture of the κάλαμος and the μαλακά, and the parable itself with its numerous parallels in Aesopian writings, as well as in rabbinic and Epicurean writings.[309] These suggest to Flusser a common centre for *The Children's Games* comparison, that of 'inconsistency' (Wankelmütigkeit), and an origin for Jewish 'classic' parables which brings together the moral concerns of a variety of contemporary traditions in the Hellenistic period. It is an example of the confluence of Jewish parables and popular philosophy.

Originally 11:19 may have linked John and Jesus together, at the same time as distinguishing their life-styles. ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου would then have been a general expression, enabling Jesus to avoid the public and explicit claim to prophetic authority on the one hand or direct humiliation in admitting how he had been criticized on the other.[310] If that was the force of the logion, and the parable was associated originally with that logion, then the parable could have hinted humorously[311] at the inconsistency of those who criticized now one and now the other for quite different reasons, when their vocations were one and the same. It would have underlined the differences between John and Jesus: John did not come eating and drinking, and they say 'a Demon'. A son of man comes eating and drinking and they say 'Look! A glutton and a drunkard, an associate of tax-collectors and sinners'.[312] It would have associated the inconsistency of their hearers with the attitudes which children display in their games. It would have hinted at the hearers' lack of perception and good sense, also shared by the children in the parable.

Unfortunately the difficulties of text, structure and vocabulary make this reconstruction only a tentative reading of the parable. The point of the parable in Matthew is anything but clear. It could concern capricious behaviour or incompatible wishes[313] on the part of some hearers, perhaps particular hearers such as the Jews, or in the case of the Q community 'this generation'. Alternatively it could be designed to expose self-righteousness on a much wider level: 'We piped to you and you did not dance; we wailed and you did not mourn.' The picture would then be of children pronouncing judgment on their peers.[314]

There is also a possible set of associations between the ascetic John and the wailing children, the celebrating Son of Man and the flute-players; the

---

309 Flusser, *Gleichnisse*, 151-153.

310 Casey, *General*, 39-40.

311 Jónsson, *Humour*, 169: 'The humorous point is the comical inconsistency of the little children, but the irony comes in when Jesus refers to grown-up people of his generation behaving in the same way.'

312 Based on Casey's retranslation into Aramaic: Casey, *General*, 39-40.

313 Luz, *Matthäus*, 1/2 186. However, his n.28 gives an incomplete picture of music and mourning: see Jones, *Musical Instruments*.

314 Schönle, *Johannes*.

parable provides for John and Jesus symbolic counterparts. That these counterparts appear in the reverse order (flute-players/mourners: John/Jesus) only serves to strengthen the suspicion that all is not as clear as it might be. The Particle γάρ (v18) linking parable and logion makes the symbolic interpretation all the more probable; why should one call for festivity and there be no response, and another for mourning, again with no response? Because John was an ascetic whereas Jesus was festive. So John becomes the one who calls for mourning and finds no response, and Jesus the one who calls for joy, again without success. Both are rejected, and the parable becomes a story of the rejection of Wisdom in all her forms.[315] Is that a plea for humble realism, or is it a plea for wider sympathies? Wisdom means humility; or Wisdom means recognizing diverse forms of divine activity. Or could the Particle γάρ strengthen the association between what this generation expects and what John and Jesus provide? The 'we' of the parable are 'this generation' and the 'you' are the prophets who disappoint us: your voices are discrepant and strange.

As far as the text of Matthew is concerned, some of these possibilities are less helpful than others. The text of 11:1-19 has developed an important set of links between the work of Jesus and the work of John, not least because both suffer persecution and rejection. So it is unlikely that the voices of John and Jesus should be heard as discrepant. They may be different, but they are not contradictory. Better, they are complementary. Both present the Kingdom of Heaven and its righteousness, albeit from different points of view. The symbolism of the parable is seen to support that conclusion; the Jesus and the John traditions are to be seen together; differing traditions are not necessarily exclusive traditions. We can conclude: first, with virtual certainty, that Matthew did not create the scholastic apothegm, or at the very least did not position the parable at its end; second, that there is a strong likelihood that the context prior to the parable and apothegm was extended beyond them into a larger complex, in harmony with a general emphasis on the work of John the Baptist and Jesus. This may have happened before the final Matthean composition. It is also possible to conclude that behind 11:16-19 there is an ancient parable which keys into popular moral instruction, and that these links influenced the way in which the parable was eventually placed in the discussion about Wisdom. The style of the parable has many remarkable features. This means that in its present context it operates both imaginatively and symbolically: imaginatively it offers the mirror of childishness and immaturity in which to see our pretence and insincerity; symbolically it challenges us to see the work of Wisdom in its wholeness and variety.

---

315 Cotter, *Children*, 302-303.

F. *The Unclean Spirit* Mt 12:43-45/Lk 11:24-26

This parable, if parable it is,[316] appears in very similar wording in Mt 12:43-45 and Lk 11:24-26,[317] but in slightly different positions within those Gospels. In Matthew it precedes the Marcan parallel on obedience and belonging to God's family (Mt 12:46-50/Mk 3:31-35) and follows the attack on the γενεὰ πονηρά[318] for its failure to emulate the Gentiles (Mt 12:38-42/Lk 11:29-32). The parable in Matthew is a warning to 'this generation' of the dangers attending all who withhold obedience. In Luke, by contrast, the parable precedes the attack on this generation (Lk 12:29-32) and follows the 'binding of the strong man' (Lk 12:22-23). This gives the parable an individual reference. It concerns the fate of an individual who, once exorcized, does not prepare himself against the devil's return.

The form of the parable is in Matthew three clear subsections, with rhythmically interesting phrases and four examples of alliteration. The style is that of the fable, and a fable which in part is told in the language of Hellenistic (Wisdom) literature.[319] Its argument is that of the fable *The Fox and the Hedgehog*,[320] which ends: 'If you take them away, another lot will come, all hungry....' It therefore could be a Jewish Wisdom Narrative which Q has given an eschatological context.

It stands in the close proximity of the parables of *The Kingdom*, *The House* and *The Strong Man*. They are a reply to the charge that Jesus' exorcisms are Beelzebub's work. Originally they may have challenged the hearers to see the danger in which they placed themselves by ascribing Jesus' work to Beelzebub.[321] They might appear as simply a defence: they are saying that family and civil strife are self-destructive; so Jesus is replying that if his exorcisms were Beelzebub's work, then it would be a case of Satan trying to oust Satan; from that point of view they are a defence offered by Jesus for his activities. If, however, originally they belonged within a context in which Jesus spoke of the Spirit's powerful

---

316 Luz, *Matthäus*, 1/2 281, 'ob es ursprünglich eine exorzistische Anweisung oder ein Gleichnis war'; Böcher, *Christus*, 17.

317 Jeremias, *Parables*, 197-198.

318 Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 32ff; Schönle, *Johannes*, 105-106; Gundry, *Matthew*, 247; Luz, *Matthäus*, 1/2 276f.

319 The language in this passage is not necessarily to be regarded as Palestinian (see Jeremias, *Parables*, 197): σχολάζω = be vacant (Beare, *Matthew*, 283; Schenk, *Sprache*, 371); ἀνάπαυσις (Jer 6:16; see Deutsch, *Wisdom*, 135-136); δι' ἀνύδρων τόπων (Arndt and Gingrich, 75-76). However, see Tobit 8:3; 11:5-15, and Sanders, *Synoptic Gospels*, 263.

320 Aristotle, *Rhet* 2.20

321 Yates, *Spirit*, 22-46. This is one of the perspectives in which the material discussed by Ziesler, *Presence*, needs to be assessed.

presence at work within his own activities, then the parables (see the logion Mt 12:32/Mk 3:29; Lk 12:10) were a warning rather than a defence; the hearers, if they deny the work of the Spirit, stand before the abyss of an unremitting judgment.[322]

In Q the polemical element of the three parables has three further features (Mt 12:27/Lk 11:19; Mt 12:28/Lk 11:20; Mt 12:30/Lk 11:23). The three parables are extended by a reference to Jewish exorcists,[323] to the arrival of the Kingdom,[324] and to the irreconcilable character of the conflict.[325] In this way the Q parables focus on the involvement of the hearers in the immediate conflict between God's Kingdom and Satan. In Luke the conflict is illustrated further by means of the parable of *The Unclean Spirit* (11:24-26); the nature of the conflict is such that unless the evil is replaced by the good, evil has the last word.

In Mark the parables answer the charge against Jesus of madness and possession (Mk 3:21-22) and confront the Jerusalem scribes with the perilous character of their error; they risk blasphemy against the Spirit.[326]

In Matthew the parables function in a different way. The writer has quoted Isaiah's prophecy of the sending of the Spirit upon the gentle victor (12:18-21) and follows the parables with references to different forms of evil (12:33-36), so that the conflict is presented in Matthew as a conflict between evil and God's Spirit. To reject God's spirit is fatal;[327] the Kingdom 'cannot stand'. (Resonances of Mt 7:24-27 may be heard here; to refuse the way of the Kingdom is to build on the sand, to accept it is to be securely founded on the rock.) If Mt 12:33ff is to be related to this overall conflict, then it must be in terms of the battle within each individual between good and evil. 12:33f appears to have been introduced by Matthew with this in mind; if so, there is a strong likelihood that Matthew intended the group of logia dealing with good and bad fruit, good and bad speech, good and bad resources, to be heard in that overall context; they are part of the conflict between God's Spirit and evil. Inner struggles are part of the great struggle between God's Spirit and evil. The three Beelzebub parables are seen as part of that inner conflict.

---

322 Yates, *Spirit*, 47-64; Reiser, *Gerichtspredigt*, 311.

323 Böcher, *Christus*.

324 Yates, *Spirit*, 85-103. On Mt 12:41f/Lk 11:31f, see Reiser, *Gerichtspredigt*, 192-215.

325 Patte's method is well suited to this oppositional element: *Matthew*, 177-178; see also Hill, *Matthew*, 217.

326 Yates, *Spirit*, 1-64; Fuchs, *Entwicklung*; Gaston, *Beelzebub*; Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit*, 44-49.

327 Cope, *Matthew*, 36; for recent discussions of the sin against the Holy Spirit, see Luz, *Matthäus*, 1/2 251-271.

The Matthean parable of *The Unclean Spirit* could therefore have followed with great appropriateness at 12:37. The reason why it does not do so must be that the parable's associations, either in its pre-Matthean context or because Matthew created the associations, are with 'this evil generation' (see 12:39,45d). As Matthew understands the parable, it is not just that the power of evil is in conflict with God's Spirit; it is that 'this generation' is caught up in the struggle. Mt 12:38ff underlines this, particularly if the interpretation of the sign of Jonah takes up the theme of conflict;[328] the Ninevites amd the Queen of the South will rise up in judgment on 'this generation'.

The position of the parable of *The Unclean Spirit* at 12:43f may or may not be due to Matthew's editorial work. If the overall pattern of conflict between the Kingdom and evil goes back to Q, and if the association of the parable with this generation's failure to guard against evil goes back to Q as well, then the position of the parable in Matthew 12 could reflect its original place in the form of Q known to Matthew. 12:43-45 could be a further example of Q material ending with a parable.

But, be that as it may, that was probably not how Matthew saw the matter. Matthew probably saw the section as concluding at 12:50 rather than at 12:45. In the context of Matthew's warning about this generation's failure and of the preceding logia on good and evil behaviour (12:33-35), *The Unclean Spirit* is linked into Mt 12:46-50 with the apothegm on 'doing the Father's will'. This concludes the sequence. Mt 12:50 rather than 12:43-45 is the climax to the section. But that conclusion is by no means necessarily foreign to the Q material. The emphasis on doing the Father's will, rather than claiming allegiance to a family, appears also in Lk 11:27-28, and could be part of that same Q sequence. Matthew's continuation of the action as far as the Marcan material about the family of Jesus (12:46-48) could therefore reflect how Matthew read the Q material rather than being an adjustment of the material to point to a fresh conclusion. 12:43-45 may not represent an example of Q material concluding with a parable. That is not to deny that Matthew contributed anything to his use of the Q material. The parable of *The Unclean Spirit* may have been primarily in Q a warning against unrepentant refusal of the eschatological signs. In Matthew, the dualistic scheme is given a fresh ethical element (12:33-37).[329] The Matthean parable of *The Unclean Spirit* appears to say: the most important safeguard against the power of evil is the development of those patterns of life which express the will of God and the powers of the Kingdom.

---

[328] Kirchgässner, *Mt 12,40*; Reiser, *Gerichtspredigt*, 192-206

[329] For an example of ethical dualism, see Mattila, *4Q246*, 537.

We can formulate the following conclusions: 1) that *The Unclean Spirit* may have concluded a section in Q, although that is not necessarily the case, and certainly in Matthew's Gospel *The Unclean Spirit* was part of a longer section which extended well beyond the parable; 2) that the Matthean form of *The Unclean Spirit* is open to a dualistic interpretation only in so far as this takes account of ethical responsibility; 3) that the four parables in this section have shifted in their functions according to their various contexts; originally (and possibly also in Mark) *The Kingdom*, *The House* and *The Strong Man* probed the existence of Jesus' opponents at its roots; in Q they explored the immediate conflict situation in which the Christian community found itself; in Matthew they deepen the hearers' appreciation of what is involved in practical responsibilities; they hint at the nature of the conflict in which followers of the humble victor find themselves engaged. The Matthean narratives have developed a function in which the metaphors create shifting images of danger and disintegration; they warn that failures and disasters in the past can happen again.

G. *The Sheep* Mt 18:12-14/Lk 13:4-6/Thomas 107

The parable of *The Sheep* concludes the first half of the discourse in Mt 18 and opens the chapter of parables in Lk 15.[330] These two versions can probably be traced back to a common similitude about a shepherd recovering a sheep and celebrating its return.[331] But the versions cannot be traced back with any certainty regarding exact form or context. Nor can they be traced back to a common source without the hypothesis of several stages in the history of that tradition. There were probably several intermediate stages between the Gospels and Q.[332] In the case of Matthew the intermediate

---

330 Schulz, *Q*, 387ff.

331 Lambrecht, *Treasure*, 39-49; but see 186-187. Also Schnider, *Verlorenen Schaf*; Arai, *Verlorenen Schaf*.

332 The following five points are interesting:

(i) The opening of the parable: τί ὑμῖν δοκεῖ/τίς ἄνθρωπος/ⲉⲧⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛ̄ⲣⲱⲙⲉ.

Although the Lucan form (Lk 15:4) is paralleled in the similitude form, its claim to be original here is questioned by some (Jeremias, *Sprache*, 244; Weder, *Gleichnisse*, 170: 'traditionell'; Buzy, *Brebis*, 56). τίς ἄνθρωπος appears Mt 2x Diff Lk (Mt 7:9; 12:11: the πρόβατον logion).

τί ὑμῖν δοκει Schenk, *Sprache*, 197. Schenk argues that all Mt 6x should be translated by an Imperative because of their judicial background (the hearer is to make up his or her mind: see 26:66). This would affect the character of the parable in 18:12-14; 18:12 should be regarded as a halakhic form rather than as a parable (Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 116f). In my judgment, this is a case where the principle of understanding language by its form-critical setting requires much more careful handling than Schenk allows. If a fictional narrative encourages

reflection towards a decision, then to treat τί ὑμῖν δοκει as requiring a decision could be fundamentally to distort the function of the following narrative. Schenk's attitude here rests on his view of Matthew's approach to Law; this we criticized on linguistic grounds earlier (p.214 n.135 above). The problem is parallel to those examples which we examined in Chapter One, where redaction-critical judgments were allowed to override the function of the language in smaller Gospel units. Furthermore Schenk's decision to treat 21:28 as redactional is based on another kind of literary redaction-critical assumption. We shall argue at 21:28 that the phrase is probably traditional (see below, p.391; note the Particle δὲ in 21:28, which has parallels in the MSS at 18:12).

(ii) οὐχί Schenk, *Sprache*, 380.

Mt 9x: 1x No Par; 1x Par Lk; 2x Diff Mk (Mk οὐ);
5x Diff Lk (Lk καὶ γάρ, γάρ, καί, 2x οὐ)

Mk 0x:

Lk 17x: 12x No Par; 2x Diff Mk; 1x Par Mt
2x Diff (1x Mt οὐ; 1x Mt >*)

Schenk states that Matthew never uses this as a simple negation. What he does not point out is that Mt uses οὐχ where Luke uses an Interrogative οὐχί in the same context as the Interrogative οὐχί Mt 13:56; and Lk uses the Interrogative οὐχί where Matthew uses that word only (Lk 6:39b Diff Mt 15:14).

(iii) πλανάω Schenk, *Sprache*, 401-410.

Schenk relates πλανάω to errors resulting from exposure to non-Matthean eschatology. The problem is similar to that raised by his noetic view of σκάνδαλον, criticized in n.135 above. The possibility of such a narrow interpretation of πλανάω is raised by the clutch of uses in ch. 24; this is narrowed still further by Schenk in a discussion of Jesus' confrontation with Sadducees; it concerns a 'questioning of reward in relation to individual immortality'; this is then used as a basis for interpreting the relation of 18:6f,8f and 12-13 (see n.353 below). Mt 24:24 is the crucial passage and there is no agreement on whether it is redactional or not; Weder, *Gleichnisse*, 171 n.17, argues for, and Schulz, *Q*, 387, argues against. Matthew has a tendency to use vocabulary again shortly after using it intially from source material. This might be such a case. GThom Logion 107 has the root **cωpм**, used in Coptic translations of πλανᾶν in Mt 18:12. The Lucan alternative, ἀπολλυμί, could be redactional or traditional (see Marshall, *Luke*, 601); it also appears in Mt 18:14. On this association, see Ezekiel 34:16.

(iv) πορευθεὶς Mt 18:12; πορεύεται Lk 15:4.

Schenk, *Sprache*, 417; Strecker, *Gerechtigkeit*, 209; Gundry, *Matthew*, 647.

The Participle πορευθεὶς is particularly common in Matthew. The issue is twofold: whether or not the narrative use should be treated as formulaic; whether the association with the Imperative is Matthean redactional. It is Hartman's view that the Participle is formulaic: *Testimonium Linguae*, 5-56; it is an indication of the limited linguistic range within which the Synoptics were written. The statistics for the Aorist Nominative Participle are:

Mt 12x: 6x No Par; 3x Diff Mk; 1x No Par or Diff Mk; 1x Par Lk; 1x Diff Lk and Par Lk (18:12 πορεύεται)

Mk 2x: 2x Text?

Lk 9x: 6x No Par; 2x Diff Mk; 1x Par Mt

Of these, some are uses with a following Imperative:

stages may have involved the creation of a unit, vv10-14; this included the parable as encouragement to fulfil the Father's purpose by caring for errant individuals.[333] Parallel to this in the history of Luke's text is the development, at the pre-Lucan stage, of a unit composed of setting, chreia, two short parables and a longer parable as in Lk 13:1-9, stressing the search for the lost and joy over their rediscovery.[334]

The version of the parable in the Gospel of Thomas differs from these two in several respects: its narrative form with reference to a past event, its description of the one sheep as ⲡⲛⲟⲩ, and its emphasis on the trouble taken by the shepherd in searching for the sheep;[335] its context and features of its narration could be part of a gnostic missionary appeal.[336] This does not mean that it did not contain elements of an older tradition,[337] nor does it mean that the significance of GThom Logion 107 is beyond dispute.[338] But as a Kingdom parable (ⲧⲙ̄ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲣⲟ ⲉⲥⲧⲛ̄ⲧⲱ̄) and as an apothegmatic parable it probably represents later stages in the parable's development.

Mt 6x: 3x No Par; 1x Diff Mk; 1x No Par or Diff Mk; 1x Par Lk
Mk 2x: 1x Text?
Lk 5x: 4x No Par; 1x Par Mt
It would be difficult, on the grounds of these figures, to argue that the Aorist Participle of πορεύομαι was redactional in Matthew but not in Luke. The permutations given in brief by Schenk underline this point. If it is redactional in both, then what promotes the agreement? Presumably a common form of speech. But to call a usage 'redactional' is to imply that it is a special and distinctive form of speech.
(v) καὶ εὑρών Lk 15:5.
Weder, *Gleichnisse*, 171, suggests that the grammar indicates pre-Lucan usage. Alongside the unusual characteristics of the Matthean text, e.g. the grammatical use of the numerals, and the dependence of the Lucan text on a 'double parable' (which again could be pre-Lucan), these five considerations suggest that the traditions cannot be traced to a common source without the hypothesis of intermediate stages of the tradition. See also the unusual ἐπί + Dative to express rejoicing.

[333] The links of v10 with vv12-14 are close: our concern is to be for the life of the individual in accordance with the heavenly Father's will. v11 is a later gloss, perhaps as early as 2 Clem 2:7, but certainly late 2nd century.

[334] Farmer, *Notes*, 301ff.

[335] It is a narrative in the Past; see the use of ϩⲓⲥⲉ in II 50,26 and Lindemann, *Thomas*, 238ff.

[336] Sheppard, *Thomas*, 244. Fieger, *Thomas*, 265-267; see 265 n.456 for a bibliography. Fieger argues that Thomas uses the synoptic tradition but changes its content to fit a different world-view in order to popularize its own gnostic system against current competitors. See also Gregg, *Lost Sheep*.

[337] Petersen, *Thomas*.

[338] The crucial phrase ⲉⲡⲛⲟⲩ ⲡⲉ is capable of several meanings: which was the greatest, leader, most important, largest. See ⲛⲟⲩ in GThom Logion 12; Fieger, *Thomas*, 266-267; Scott, *Parable*, 408f.

Attempts to give Logion 107 a central position in the early tradition history of the parable have failed.

Closely linked with the place of GThom 107 is the parabolic tradition behind Jn 10:11-18. Both of them refer to the cost borne by the shepherd. Derrett[339] associates with this tradition the picture of the shepherd bearing the lamb on his shoulders, a picture with pagan, Jewish and Christian significance.[340] But the tradition which Derrett reconstructs has a realism and detail which no synoptic parable text can match. There is no textual authority, either synoptic or extra-synoptic, for that style of the parable.

The Matthean form of the parable has two balancing halves, each introduced by ἐὰν γένηται: ἐὰν γένηταί τινι ἀνθρώπῳ/ἐὰν γένηται εὑρεῖν αὐτό.... This is absent from the Lucan form of *The Sheep*. The origin of this double Conditional is much discussed. It could well be pre-Matthean,[341] and have been a way of emphasizing the double form of the

---

339 Derrett, *Sheep*, 60.

340 Scott, *Parable*, 411.

341 There are three factors to consider here:
(i) The Conditional form. This can be examined using the material provided by Beyer, *Semitische Syntax*, I 228, 253ff. Mt 18:12 belongs with Mt 16:24; 21:3; 22:24 and 24:23; these latter are all Par Mk. Constructions parallel to these are all given the category 'g'. The form-critical evaluation of this Greek construction was begun by Käsemann, *Questions*, 66-81, and continued by Berger, *Sätzen heiligen Rechts*, 10-40, who distinguishes the community rules with their second-person address from the third-person Conditionals, and their wide use in relation to actions of judgment (see Schmidt, *Prophetic Correlative*, 517ff). Difficulties with this analysis in the case of the Matthean parable of *The Sheep* are that the construction belongs to a unit which includes both second- (vv10, 14) and third-person elements (see also 18:15; on the pre-Matthean character of the Conditionals in 18:15ff, see p.23 n.22), and the two Conditionals are only parallel in their protases; their apodoses differ: only v12b is Interrogative; v13b is a statement and does not as such belong to a 'judgment' Sitz im Leben. In neither respect does the parable fit easily with an evaluation in strictly form-critical terms. We may well in this case have to recognize the uniqueness of the form and recognize that content may not correspond to form. Two possible explanations of the Conditional form remain: 1) the Conditional belongs to a pre-Matthean form of the parable (pace Davies, *Matthew*, II 773): the partner to the Lucan parable of *The Sheep* is *The Coin* (Lk 15:8f) and 15:8f has a structure comparable in four respects to Mt 18:15f: *The Lost Coin* uses ἐαν + Subjunctive, the Interrogative οὐχί in the first part, a statement about rejoicing in the second, and an οὕτως logion to complete the unit; 2) a plethora of Conditionals surrounds the parable, and it could be that the form of the Matthean parable of *The Sheep* was influenced by this, or, if Q originally had the sequence Lk 17:1-2/14:34-35 = Mk 9:50/Lk 15:4-7, and Matthew moved from Marcan to Q material with an overlap of the two, the form of Mk 9:45-50 could have helped to shape the Matthean parable of *The Sheep*. Of these explanations, 1) is the more complete response, but 1) and 2) are not necessarily mutually exclusive. γένηται could be traditional and γένηταί τινι could be Matthean.

earlier parable.[342] The Conditional form does however appear in a related Lucan context. It appears in Lk 15:8 in *The Lost Coin,* the parallel parable to *The Lost Sheep* in Luke, along with other features[343] found in Matthew 18:12-14. The two halves of the Matthean parable also end with a Participle from πλανάω[344] (the first Present, the second Perfect), giving structural emphasis to the key word in the Matthean version of the parable.[345] There is a parallel in Luke's use of ἀπολλυμί. πλανάω has, contrary to the opinion of some, a wide range of reference. It includes misleading prophets and treacherous and immoral paths,[346] and links the parable not only with the disciplinary section in 18:17ff but also with the concerns expressed in another feature of ch. 18, the σκάνδαλον/σκανδαλίζω group.[347] The metaphor of sheep gathers to it in ch. 18 the metaphor of 'wandering', the Old Testament associations of divine care,[348] and the mediation of that care through prophets and leaders, especially the issue of pastoral responsibility and authority[349] which Peter's place among the disciples raised. Within this field of reference provided by πρόβατον and πλανάω, the second use of ἐὰν γένηται, ἐὰν γένηται εὑρεῖν αὐτό introduces a warning note (see v14). It hints that the sheep may not be found.[350] But this is balanced by a reference to joy, as the protasis gives way to an apodosis. The statement χαίρει recalls again the style of a similitude.

There are several other traditional features of the parable which are significant. They draw into the framework of the Matthean narrative interests expressed in the wider context of ch. 18. ἕν ἐξ αὐτῶν hints at the

---

(ii) γίνομαι + Dative.
This occurs:
Mt 5x: 3x No Par; 1x Diff Mk (Mt 15:28); 1x Diff Lk
Mk 2x: 2x >. In general γίνομαι is best treated as part of an interchange of constructions involving εἰμί as well as γίνομαι.
(iii) εὑρεῖν. See Blass, Debrunner, Funk §409, where the parallels are from Acts.

[342] The twofold construction of the parable, each part beginning with a Conditional, has been compared with other distinctively shaped Matthean parables. These suggest that a twofold parabolic structure may be traditional.

[343] Compare Mt 18:14 ἵνα ἀπόληται and Lk ἀπολέσας, τὸ ἀπολωλὸς, ἀπολέσῃ. See also Rowland, *Mysticism*, and Lambrecht, *Treasure*, 51, on the association of angels with Lk 15:10; although this is important, so is the omission of any reference to angels in Mt 18:14.

[344] See n.332 (iii) above and Petersen, *Sheep*, 140ff.

[345] See Test Levi 10:2; Test Judah 17:1.

[346] Didache 16:3-5.

[347] See p.214 n.135.

[348] *TDNT*, 6.690. For the ambiguity of 'shepherd' in the first century CE, see Scott, *Parable*, 413.

[349] Kahmann, *Verheissung*, 261ff.

[350] Scott, *Parable*, 416.

apparently insignificant loss[351] to the flock, which the context and the parable suggest must be given a fresh value. τοῖς μὴ πεπλανημένοις focuses the end of the second half of the parable on those who might not share the shepherd's joy, challenging, as *The Unforgiving Servant* does, the genuineness of the community's concern for its members. There is also the parallel with Mt 12:11 (Diff Lk). If it is correct that Mt 12:11 uses humanitarian concern as a foundation for instruction,[352] then the parable of *The Sheep* may play upon the same concern, strengthening the call to humanitarian care through its narrative function.

Some of these factors appear clearly when the passage is heard rather than read. One feature of 18:12 may owe its existence to an oral Sitz im Leben: the change from Future ἀφήσει to the Present of a similitude ζητεῖ. This last phrase, καὶ πορευθεὶς ζητεῖ τὸ πλανώμενον, which visually is seen as part of the Interrogative apodosis and may be the original text, could be heard as part of an extended sentence, divided into its separate phrases, and so as a separate unit.

This Matthean parable is therefore yet another distinctive form. A tightly structured unit, composed of elements of parable, similitude, apothegm and Wisdom, it seems to have been designed to refract several interests; and with its emblematic metaphor, and the latter's associations and word fields, it offers a narrative which relates not just to one but to several different pieces of instruction and advice inside and outside ch. 18.

This finding needs however to be put into context. There is an overall agreement of shape between the Matthean parable and the hypothetical earlier form of the similitude. First, the Matthean version in its initial sentence corresponds to a synoptic pattern for which Beyer[353] provides twenty-two texts and text forms. Two of these are the Lucan parables of *The Sheep* and *The Lost Coin*. The pattern comprises: 1) an introductory question; 2) a relative clause belonging to the protasis; 3) a statement or rhetorical question as apodosis (distinguishing the synoptic pattern from Hebrew and LXX parallels). Second, in its second half, the Matthean version corresponds to other synoptic parables: it expands[354] this initial pattern into neatly phrased narratives, as in some Lucan examples of the Lucan doublets. In both these respects the Matthean form of *The Sheep* is only marginally different from other synoptic parallels. It is marginally tighter in construction and marginally wider in its frame of reference.

---

[351] Bonnard, *Matthieu*, 273; Bishop, *Wandering Sheep*, 44ff; Bussby, *Shepherd*, 93ff.

[352] Sigal, *Halakah*.

[353] Beyer, *Semitische Syntax*, I.1.287-288.

[354] Beyer, *Semitische Syntax*, I.1.288-289.

Just as the Matthean parable draws interests into the narrative from other parts of ch. 18, the Lucan version too is open to its context. The context in ch. 15 is Jesus' eating and drinking with sinners as a demonstration of the divine love. To this corresponds the searching for and the regaining of the lost. But to this is added in 15:7,10 an emphasis on repentance, which highlights a specific reaction to the outcast and the importance of communal celebration at the finding of the lost 15:6 (see also 15:32).[355]

But neither Matthew nor Luke has edited the parable heavily to suit the new context. Matthew may well have been able to use the parable at the end of the first half of ch. 18 without many changes. Editorial signs in the Lucan form also are relatively few. The new elements which were built into the parables required only minor touches. Both versions display adaptability, and this gave both Gospel writers considerable freedom.

The versions, based as they were on an older scheme, diverged at points where translation variants cannot be an explanation of their differences. So at some point, presumably in the Q strata, they must have received new additions to their structure and vocabulary, almost certainly at a Greek stage of their existence. This means that the only ways back to the original parable of Jesus are: 1) through that older scheme with its initial triple-form sentence, its contrast between one sheep and a hundred, and its emphasis on overwhelming joy as the lost sheep is found and restored through his owner's care; 2) through the theory of a sub-story, identifiable in all the extant forms, which challenges the surface story, asking questions which the surface story does not answer: Was the man foolish to abandon the ninety-nine? Where they safe on his return? Why this concern with one sheep? But at this point the emblematic metaphor becomes an embarrassment because of its range of associations. Sheep and shepherd as metaphors ensure that many interpretations of the original parable's picture are possible; none carries exclusive conviction. The Old Testament association of 'sheep' as a reference to Israel, and of shepherd as an ambiguous reference to God,[356] has a strong claim. The parable could originally have been an affirmation of the divine purpose for those who, though they belong within the covenant, nevertheless fall away. On the other hand, it could, because of its emphasis on the single sheep, have had an individual reference from the beginning; the interpretation of the parable as concerned with the individual would certainly match several of the other parables in both Matthew and Luke (especially those in Lk 15).

---

[355] Kossen, *Paraboles*, 75f; Dupont, *Brebis Perdue*, 331-350. For the argument that Mt 18:13 retains an authentic element, see also Focant, *Brebis Perdue*. On the Imitatio Dei theme in the parable, see Davies, *Matthew*, II 768.

[356] See Scott, *Parable*.

In conclusion, the parable of *The Sheep* was adopted by Matthew in a form which gave it a wide range of reference, already suited to, and perhaps already part of, material relating to community care. Matthew's adoption of the parable without major alterations indicates an approach to the functioning of parables which takes account of their adaptability as narratives. While the positioning of the parable of *The Sheep* at the end of the first half of ch. 18 may be due to the editor's desire to balance the first half of the chapter with the second, it may also have been suggested by any one of several factors: Mk 9:50, the thread of Q material, or the subject of community discipline (18:15-17). It is also possible that, like the final parable in the chapter, it offers a response to the initial question in 18:1: 'Who is the greatest?' The question 'Who is the greatest?' can be answered by 'A child', and 18:10-14 is concerned that no little one should be undervalued.

Conclusion to Chapter Four

The four main 'summary parables' are climactic. They support the discourses, and bring these to a memorable conclusion. They are not summaries in a contentual sense, except perhaps for 25:31ff, which brings together features from the discourses in an editorially designed climax not merely to the eschatological discourse, but to all the discourses. A single definitive interpretation of the summary parables is not possible. The reasons for this vary. In the case of 7:24-27 and 18:23ff cross-currents of interests and the use of metaphor prevent any attempt to simplify the relation of the parable to its context, and the narrative provides too many points of interest to allow selection of an exclusive focus of attention. In the case of 13:52 an enigmatic sentence offers as a symbolic phrase to evoke the concerns of the preceding sections. Although single definitive interpretations are not possible in the case of the summary parables, undercurrents of interest and belief can be sensed in the choice of material, in the relation of the parables to their context, and even in their structure and character. Only in the final parable do these come to the surface. The positioning of the summary parables seems to have been motivated by the example of the Q tradition and its use of the parable of *The Two Houses.* The other non-summary parables which conclude units of material in Matthew, *The Children's Games*, *The Unclean Spirit*, *The Sheep*, do not have the same kind of structural significance in Matthew; no editorial reason can be identified for their present position, although they may have possessed this role at an earlier stage in their history. Only *The Sheep* can be said to be structurally important. The absence of a parable at the conclusion of ch. 10

further supports the view that the 'summary' parable is a result of following traditional precedents.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE CHAPTER OF PARABLES

Introduction: The Chapter as a Whole

(i) *The Context*

The following features of the context of Mt 13 have already been identified:[1] God's messengers have been rejected; these included John the Baptist (Mt 11:7-24), and the Son of God, who brought the revelation of the Father's will (Mt 11:25-30; 12:18-21) and made fully known the moral demands of God; the rejection of the messengers took many forms: refusal to hear, persecution of the messengers, and the demand for attestation. The result of that rejection will be condemnation at the Day of Judgment (Mt 11:21-24; 12:38-45). Acceptance of God's agents, on the other hand, brings blessing and renewal; it carries responsibilities: mercy and humanitarian concern (Mt 12:7,9-13), a change of heart and incorporation into God's family (Mt 12:46-50. All this is possible through the protection of the Spirit (Mt 12:25-32,43-45), without whom the powers of evil gain (Mt 12:33-35), or regain (Mt 12:43-45),[2] their hold. Rejection or acceptance, success in resisting evil or failure are of ultimate significance, for everyone, even for those who acknowledge the Son and the Kingdom, because judgment at the Last Day will be according to words and deeds (Mt 12:37); and all these features together relate to the responsibilities and privileges of being a disciple of the Kingdom (Mt 13:52).[3]

This context for Mt 13 is the result of a juxtaposition of Marcan and Q material, the Marcan material providing the main outline. So the Matthean editor's use of Mk 3:22-35 concludes with Mt 12:46-50, and the following verse, Mk 4:1/Mt 13:1, begins the chapter of parables without a decisive literary break to separate that chapter from its preceding context.[4]

---

[1] pp.269, 111-113.

[2] pp.270-272.

[3] p.208.

[4] Major treatments of Mt 13 are: Bornkamm, *Enderwartung*, 13-47 (I have supplemented this by notes from his Heidelberg lectures); Cope, *Matthew*, 15-31; Davies, *Matthew* II; Dupont, *Paraboles*, 221-259; Gerhardsson, *Parables*, 16-37; Gundry, *Handbook*, 250-282; Hagner, *Matthew*, I 361-407; Kingsbury, *Parables*; Luz, *Matthäus*, 1/2 291-378; Wilkens, *Redaktion* .

(ii) *The redaction*

The most important aspects of the redaction of Mt 13 are:

1. *The Old Testament Quotations*

A fuller form of Isa 6:9ff is given in Mt 13:14ff than is found in Mk 4:12. This fuller form is capable of a number of different interpretations within the Matthean context.[5] It could be understood as a strengthening or a modification of a Marcan 'hardening theory',[6] or as a challenge to that theory.[7] Much depends on how the Marcan 'hardening theory' is to be understood. If the Marcan is understood as a hardening of everyone except the inner group of the disciples, then the view that Matthew challenges suh a theory has much to commend it,[8] particularly because Mt 13:35 (Diff Mk), the quotation from Ps 77:2, is best understood as a public declaration of God's mysteries for all the crowds. The repetition and emphatic position of ἐν παραβολαῖς in 13:34,35, the Verb ἐρεύξομαι in 13:35 which lends itself to public proclamation, and the omission from Mt 13:34 of the

---

[5] On the textual question, see Stendahl, *School*, 130-131; Lindars, *Apologetic*, 155 n.2; Cope, *Matthew*, 18; Davies, *Matthew*, I 32-58; Gundry, *Matthew*, 116ff; Prabhu, *Quotations*, 31-35; Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 23-24; Stanton, *Gospel*, ch. 15. Stendahl treats the exact agreement of the quotation in Matthew with Acts 28:26ff and the unusual character of the formula citation as evidence of a post-Matthean interpolation (see also McConnell, *Law*, 142; Davies, *Matthew*, I 51; Prabhu, *Quotations*, 35). The main objections to the longer text illustrate the inadequacies of contemporary redactional method: a pattern is established to which redaction should correspond, and the features which do not appear to fit with that pattern can then be questioned textually, without serious text-critical support; for some answers to Stendahl, see van Segbroek, *Citations*, 126-128; Trilling, *Wahre Israel*, 60 n.18; Cerfaux, *La connaissance*. See Luz, *Matthäus*, 1/1 138 n.27. On the type of text used by Matthew, see Gundry, *Use*, and Luz, *Matthäus*, 1/1 137 n.21; Davies, *Matthew*, I 33-57 (13:13 is classified as Mt against Mk, both against LXX); Marbury, *Text-types*, provides some of the material for which Davies and Allison are asking, as does Graham Davies (see p.10 n.6).

[6] Gnilka, *Verstockungsproblem*, 119ff; Wilkens, *Redaktion*, 305ff, treats ὅτι (13:13) as giving the ground why the Jews do not understand.

[7] van Elderen, *Matthew 13*; Filson, *Matthew*, 158-60; Flusser, *Gleichnisse*, 253ff.

[8] See Hooker, *Mark*, 125-139, who makes three points: 1) that Mark shares the view that Israel's obduracy is to be attributed to God; 2) that although the Twelve are contrasted with 'those outside' the distinction is not rigid, since it is a matter of who responds to Jesus' invitation; 3) that there are some surprises about who responds and who does not. See Räisänen, *Parabeltheorie*, 8ff. For a full bibliography, see Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium*, 458 n.97. Mt 15:7ff is not sound evidence for a 'hardening theory' in Matthew. Its use of parable and parabolic interpretation encourages repentance.

Marcan phrase[9] κατ'ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς ἰδίοις μαθηταῖς ἐπέλυεν πάντα (Mk 4:34) all make the continuity of 13:34 and 13:35 clear: everyone hears parables; and the parables can reveal hidden mysteries. The parables are accessible to the general public, and so possibly also the mysteries which they can reveal, although only to those who 'hear'. If, on the other hand, the Marcan 'hardening theory' (Mk 4:12) reflects the surprising and puzzling experience among early Christians that some outsiders respond (7:29), as well as that some insiders fail (see Mk 4:11), and if 'those who heard' includes all who responded, however hesitatingly or inconsistently (see Mk 4:34),[10] then Matthew might be said to confirm the Marcan theory, although perhaps modifying it superficially in certain important respects.

For example, if the 'hardening theory' is understood in this looser and more nuanced way, Mt 13:14ff could be understood as a minor modification of the Marcan theory because it introduces into that form of the 'hardening theory' a clearer element of responsibility. The change is only a superficial one because there is a recognition in Mark too that the hearers carry significant responsibility; the parables are offered as a challenge, and response to that form of teaching lies within their power; they could 'hear'.[11] But in Matthew the level of that responsibility is explicit. It is because people look without seeing that Jesus has to speak in parables (13:13a). 13:13 suggests that the hearers carry a heavy responsibility: it is their fault that Jesus must speak as he does and that they understand as little as they do. 13:15 suggests that there is a deliberate refusal to see: they have closed their eyes (26:43). But there is a major ambiguity in the Matthean citation. The phrase μήποτε ἴδωσιν (Mt 13:15c) is ambiguous. Traditionally the μήποτε was interpreted to mean that the blindness was unavoidable (see Acts 28:26; Romans 11:8). God had rendered the sinful people blind and prevented their cure. The people are blind, whereas 'you see' (Mt 13:16-17). It could however mean in the Matthean context 'perhaps':[12] 'perhaps they may see with their eyes and hear with their ears and understand in their heart and turn, and I shall heal them.' The context, of course, appears to provide a major difficulty for this latter interpretation of Mt 13:14ff: Mt 13:12, the logion removed from the later position in Mk 4:25 into its new Matthean position in the immediate context of the Isaianic quotation, appears to reinforce the impression given by Mt 13:11b that, for

[9] Klauck, *Allegorie*, 255f, regards the omission as pointing to a revelation of the crowd's hardened hearts and coming rejection of the Messiah. However, the Wisdom context for chs. 11-13 includes open proclamation as well as rejection; see Nolan, *Son*, 176ff.

[10] See Tuckett, *Parables*, 12-20.

[11] Hooker, *Mark*, 138.

[12] See 2 Tim 2:25 (and possibly Mt 25:9 pace Luz, *Matthäus*, 1/2 314 n.188).

some, the situation is irremediable: ἐκείνοις δὲ οὐ δέδοται (Mt 13:11b), and ἀκοῇ ἀκούσετε καὶ οὐ μὴ συνῆτε (Mt 13:14) appears to be reinforced by ὅστις γὰρ ἔχει δοθήσεται αὐτῷ καὶ περισσευθήσεται· ὅστις δὲ οὐκ ἔχει καὶ ὃ ἔχει ἀρθήσεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ (13:12).[13] But 13:11b and 12 need not be understood as an exclusive claim; it need not mean that some understand fully while others do not understand at all: all stand in serious jeopardy (see Mt 13:8c), not least those who have once been freed from evil but do not succeed in remaining free (see 12:43-45);[14] and the second appearance of the 13:12 logion in Mt 25:29 can be interpreted in the same way.[15] The privilege mentioned in v12a and 25:29 is open to all who hear. Particularly important for this discussion are two factors concerning the text of Isaiah. First, that both within the Book of Isaiah and outside its text the uses of Isa 6:9-10 switch from declaration of divine judgment, expressed in God's hardening of the hearts of the people, to new expressions of responsibility before God (e.g. Isa 32:3).[16] In Paul's epistles, too, Isa 6:9-10 does not spell out final, irrevocable disaster. Second, the LXX quotation used by Matthew includes the phrase τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου (13:15a), which is usually taken to be a reference to the Jewish nation. However, the introductory formula to that quotation, 13:14, indicates that the citation is being fulfilled in respect of those who do not hear (ἀναπληροῦται αὐτοῖς, referring to αὐτοῖς in 13:10). There is a 'lack of fit' between the text of the citation and its Matthean application. So Mt 13:10-15 refers to the possibility of repentance and healing, even for those who as yet are blind. Some may fail to respond, but the division between those 'inside' and those 'outside' is not an apocalyptic division between the 'called' and the 'damned', but between those who reject God's agents and those who accept them.[17] The purpose of the parables is therefore, as Matthew presents it, to open up the possibility of another chance, the chance of repentance, for all, even for those who failed to respond initially and originally were blind and deaf. Matthew's understanding of ὑμῖν δέδοται...ἐκείνοις δὲ οὐ δέδοται is not in that case an unbridgeable gulf between the 'called' and the 'damned': the 'damned' may repent,[18] and the 'called' may fail (see 22:14). Both are equally possible. Matthew modifies the so-called Marcan 'hardening theory'

---

[13] Kingsbury, *Parables*, 28ff.

[14] See ch.4 p.271.

[15] See ch.7 p.471.

[16] McLaughlin, *Isaiah 6,9-10*, 23.

[17] See especially the Matthean version of the parable of *The Sower* discussed below, p.298.

[18] The place of Judas within this pattern is discussed by Brown, *Death*, I 638-644, and II Appendix 4.

by strengthening the role of parables in enabling repentance to happen. The modification is only a superficial one, but it is there.

Such a viewpoint fits well with the earlier treatment of salvation-history in our study of 13:52[19] and points to a more fundamental shift away from the Marcan position. In Mark, Isa 6:9-10 declares that Israel's obduracy is due to divine judgment. In Matthew 'this people' (13:15), with reference to whom Isaiah's prophecy is being fulfilled, is not now definable primarily as the Jewish people. The quotation does not begin by identifying who the people are (as Isa 6:9a LXX does). It begins with the second-person Plural: 'You hear and do not understand.' It is general, not racially specific. This does not dispel the mystery of the Marcan 'hardening theme'. On the contrary. It is no more evident why some Gentiles hear and others do not, than why some Jews hear and others do not. The mystery remains; it deepens because of the surprise inclusion of the apparently rejected and the surprise exclusion of the apparently accepted (22:9-14). Acts of divine grace are no less mysterious and perplexing than divine judgment.[20] Such a view of Matthew 13 contrasts strongly with some of the classic treatments of Mt 13. Kingsbury[21] treats 13:10-17 as the turning-point of the Gospel. Jesus, having been rejected by the Jews, charges them with blindness and lends substance to his charge by using enigmatic speech. The reverse of this is Jesus' address to his disciples, to whom God reveals the insights into his kingly rule (13:11a), as an eschatological statute, giving the disciples, in Israel's place, the promise of a share in the Kingdom. The Jews cannot understand (Mt 13:13); thus they lose the Kingdom and its fellowship. The disciples, by contrast, are understanding witnesses to the words for the crowd; for the disciples, the fruit of obedience and the understanding of the mysteries have to go together (see Mk 4:25). The parables are therefore both a way of reserving the initiative to God, and a form of punishment (see ὅτι in v13).[22] Gerhardsson[23] makes Mt 13 a damaged version of an original seven-parable unit, used to express vengeance on the church's persecutors, the bitterness of which is evident from Mt 13:10-15. Luz[24] treats ch. 13 as a narrative, transparent in that the historical experience of the Matthean community appears through it: it is for them a fact that the majority of Israel has declined to hear and the Christian community has become separate from 'the people'. The prophecy of Isaiah has been fulfilled in the people's refusal (μήποτε in Matthew means 'in order that' but takes nothing from

[19] See ch.4 pp.206-207.
[20] Bornkamm, *Enderwartung*, 16ff.
[21] Kingsbury, *Parables*, 38ff.
[22] Dupont, *Paraboles*, 234ff.
[23] Gerhardsson, *Parables*, 16ff.
[24] Luz, *Matthäus*, 1/2 291-296.

Israel's responsibility). These are classic treatments of Mt 13, but they do not monitor carefully enough the movements of thought within 13:10-15, and, more important still, they fail to do justice to the particular character of salvation-history in Matthew, of which 21:43 and 13:52 are teasing reminders.

So the purpose of the Old Testament passage in Mt 13:14f is twofold: first, in modifying Mark superficially, it underlines the role of the parables in marking the crucial division among humankind and in making possible a 'repentant response' to the Son's revelation as he fulfils the ancient expectations of Israel (Mt 13:16f); second, Mt 13:14ff amplifies, in association with Kingdom imagery, the benefits, privileges and responsibilities associated with the Son's coming.

2. *The Outline of Mark and the Additional Parables*

The shape of the Marcan chapter of parables is much discussed, and some of that discussion is relevant to the question of Matthean redaction.[25] Mk 4:10 appears to divide the chapter between teaching given to the crowd and teaching given only to the disciples. This impression is strengthened: 1) by the division between the 'you' addressed in 4:11 and 'those outside' mentioned in 4:12 (see also 4:33-34), 2) by the implication in 4:12 that the former may understand and the latter will not, and 3) by 4:21-25, 'those who have will receive more' and 'those who have not will lose what they have'. This does not fit easily with the impression given by 4:33-34a that there was general teaching and that people understood it as they were able. The position of the parables of *The Seed Growing Secretly* and *The Mustard Seed* is ambiguous within this area of discussion. They announce the mystery of the Kingdom's arrival and its silent growth, and they follow the announcement in 4:10 that Jesus is alone with his disciples. Yet the parables (τοιαύταις παραβολαῖς) by which the general audience is addressed in 4:33-44 would naturally include both Kingdom parables, as well as *The Sower.*

The attempts to ease these difficulties by attributing some aspects to source material and others to redaction have explained the inconsistencies in the material but not always why an editor should have put the elements together in the Marcan form and order. Nor has it been easy to see why the disciples should have been 'given' the mystery of the Kingdom of God in ch. 4, only to appear later in Mark to be lacking in basic understanding of Jesus.[26] One solution to these problems was hinted at above. It is to accept Mk 4:33-34 as the section's 'last word' on the subject, but to recognize that

[25] Tuckett, *Parables.*

[26] See Hooker, *Mark*; Räisänen, *Parabeltheorie*; Hahn, *Mk iv.3-8,14-20*; Pesch, *Markusevangelium*; Lambrecht, *Mk.IV*; Kee, *Community.*

the division between 'haves' and 'have nots' is not simply that between disciples and crowd. Mark has encouragement and warnings for all. Mk 4 offers assurance of the privileged position of being a hearer and a follower, but leaves no doubt concerning the attendant dangers and responsibilities. This solution would mean that 4:10, while underlining aspects of the privileges open to those who receive the full range of Jesus' teaching, public and private, is not the structural key to 4:1-34. 4:1-34 is a narrative exposing several concerns about discipleship, and the setting out of those concerns is a major motivation in the ordering of the material.

A similar problem arises in the case of Matthew 13.[27] Is there a distinction to be made between instruction to the disciples and instruction to the crowd, and, if so, how is the material organized in relation to that distinction: is there a break at 13:23, or at 13:36, or should we look for a different kind of organization, such as a correspondence between 13:1-9 and 13:51-2, as a kind of inclusio? The fact that none of these has won general acceptance makes the parallel history of Marcan parabolic research all the more valuable. Perhaps in Matthew 13 also we are not to expect absolute clarity at every point on the matter of the chapter's organization.

As far as Mark is concerned, one agreed factor is that Mark is using parabolic material and offering a reinterpretation of it. Mk 4:1-9, 4:13-20, 4:21-25, 4:26-29, 4:30-32 offer various reflections on the nature of discipleship, and are seen in a fresh light because of their Marcan associations. It seems that in Mt 13 Matthew was engaged in the same process.[28] Illustrations of this are: the replacement of *The Seed Growing Secretly* (Mk 4:26-29) with the parable of *The Tares* (Mt 13:24-30; 31-32; 13:33) as one of a group of parables (13:24-30; 13:31-32; 13:33), each introduced by ἄλλην παραβολήν; and the addition, after the end of the Marcan outline, of the Interpretation of *The Tares*, with a further triplet of parables leading to the final parable of *The Householder*.

The effect of this redactional Matthean procedure is to retain most of the Marcan parabolic material, including *The Sower*, but to supplement it with groups of Kingdom parables. In one way this is a strange piece of redactional work,[29] since it leaves *The Sower*, not itself obviously a Kingdom parable, among a cluster of explicitly Kingdom parables. In the study of individual parables it will be important to ask why this should be; whether, for example, *The Sower* is retained mainly because it is part of Matthew's source material, or whether there is a more positive reason. It will be necessary to enquire what motivated the replacement of *The Seed Growing Secretly* by the Kingdom parable of *The Tares*; and to discover why

[27] See ch.3 pp.112-113.
[28] Weder, *Gleichnisse*, 99ff.
[29] Cope, *Matthew*, 15; Toussaint, *Parables*, 351ff.

the Interpretation of *The Tares* is separated from the parable of *The Tares* and linked instead with a triplet outside the Marcan outline.

Regarding the parables added to the Marcan outline, four aspects of the organization of Matthew 13 are relevant: the use of Particles, the character of the sources, the issue of inclusio and chiasmus, and the character of the editorial work. First, the use of Particles. In Mt 13, as in chs. 24-25, the Particles do not make the material as a whole into a logical progression of thought.[30] That much is clear from the varied accounts which scholars have

---

[30] The following survey illustrates the lack of logical flow: (bold Particles indicate 'possibly redactional'; x indicates 'no Particle'; Verse Diff Mk means that in that verse Mt differs from Mark substantially.

v1	**x**		Verse: Diff Mark; on the setting, see p.13 n.14
v2	καὶ		Verse: Par Mk (see Mt 13:2a/Mk 4:1b)
v3	καὶ		Verse: Par Mk (see Mt 13:3a/Mk 4:2b)
			The Sower: Par Mk
	ἰδοὺ		In both Mt and Mk; Mt lacks Mk's ἀκούετε (Mk 4:3)
v4	καὶ	v5 **δὲ** (Mk καὶ); v6 **δὲ** (Mk καὶ); v7 **δὲ** (Mk καὶ); v8 **δὲ** (Mk καὶ)	
v9	**x**		Verse: Par Mk (But Mk 4:9 καὶ ἔλεγεν > Mt; also > Lk)
v10	καὶ		Verse: Diff Mk (See Mt Par Lk); The disciples' question
v11	**δὲ**		Verse: Diff Mk (See Mt Par Lk); Jesus' reply
v12	γάρ		Verse: Par Mk (see Mk 4:25/Lk 8:18)
v13	**διὰ**	τοῦτο	Verse: Diff Mk 4:11b; Par Mk 4:12
v14	καὶ		Verse: No Par Fulfilment Quotation
v15	γάρ		Verse: No Par Fulfilment Quotation: (with μήποτε)
v16	δὲ		Verse: Diff Lk: Marks a contrast: '**Your** eyes are blessed'
v17	**x**		Verse: Par Lk (Lk γάρ). Mt 13:17a is textually uncertain
v18	**οὖν**		Verse: Diff Mk
			The Interpretation of *The Sower*: Par Mk
			v19 **x** (Mk δὲ); v20 **δὲ** (Mk καὶ); v21 **x** (Mk καὶ);
			v22 **δὲ** (Mk καὶ); v23 **δὲ** (Mk καὶ)
v24	**x**	ἄλλην παραβολήν	Verse: No Par
			The parable of *The Tares*. No Par
			vv25-29 δὲ; v30 x
v31	**x**	ἄλλην παραβολήν	
			The parable of *The Mustard Seed*. Par Mk/Par Lk
v32		μέν...δέ	Verse Par Mk/Par Lk
v33	**x**	ἄλλην παραβολήν	
			The parable of *The Leaven*. Par Lk/Diff Lk
v34	**x**	ταῦτα πάντα	Verse: Par Mk (Mk 4:33)
	καὶ		Verse: Par Mk (Mk 4:34a); Mk δὲ
v35	x		Verse: No Par Fulfilment Quotation
v36	τότε		Verse: No Par. Jesus leaves the crowds; house teaching
			The Interpretation of *The Tares*. No Par
			vv37-39 δὲ v40 ὥσπερ οὖν; v41 x ; v42 καὶ; v43 τότε
v44	**x**	ὁμοία	Verse: No Par
			The parable of *The Treasure*. No Par
v45		πάλιν ὁμοία	Verse: No Par

given of the argument of ch. 13.[31] This could indicate that the Particles are a means of relating the source material to the discourse as a whole, without each part of the discourse being a step in a carefully prepared argument. For example, they could be part of a pattern of literary connections allowing some sections to 'speak for themselves';[32] and they could incorporate Particles used by pre-Matthean groupings of material.[33] The way in which the Particles relate to the composition of the chapter needs to be re-assessed.

A second general question concerns the character of the sources used by Matthew in ch. 13. Conflicting claims have been made regarding the agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark in the discourses.[34] An important observation here is that, apart from the obvious agreements in vocabulary, additions and omissions, all of which can be monitored by study of a synopsis, there are also less obvious agreements. There are, for example, the agreements in syntactical usage.[35] It will be seen, as individual parables are analysed, that the agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark, when they are all listed, are more numerous than has been realized.[36] The extent of the agreements warrants further investigation. Moreover because the agreements relate to parables and their interpretations the extent of the agreements raises distinct problems requiring distinctive solutions.

The third general issue concerns rhetorical figures. Particularly in the discussion of this Matthean discourse, arguments claiming the editorial

---

	The parable of *The Pearl.* No Par
v46 δὲ	No Par
v47	πάλιν ὁμοία Verse: No Par
	The parable of *The Net.* No Par
	v48 ἦν ὅτε; v49 οὕτως ἔσται; v50 καὶ. No Par
v51 x	συνήκατε ταῦτα πάντα; λέγουσιν αὐτῷ. ναί. Verse: No Par
v52 δὲ	The parable of *The Householder.* No Par
v53 καὶ	Verse: No Par/Diff Mk (Mk καὶ). Concluding Formula

There are indications here of a framework, and possibly of a direction of thought in parts of vv1-18; but there is no clear movement of thought from vv19-34 or from the beginning of the chapter to the end. To emphasize the ταῦτα πάντα in v34 and the shift of setting at v36 is to highlight the problem of continuity through vv19-33.

[31] See the summary and bibliography in Luz, *Matthäus*, 1/2 293.

[32] The loose grouping of parables in Mt 13:24-33 might suggest that they can be treated individually with some freedom, as in the discussion on pp.56-57.

[33] Compare 13:24-33 with 13:44-50.

[34] Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium*, 461; Weder, *Gleichnisse*, 115; pace Wenham, *Interpretation*, 305f, *Structure*, 516f. See ch.1 p.29 n.34.

[35] See p.303 n.82.

[36] See p.303 n.79; also Kingsbury, *Parables*, 145 n.45; Klauck, *Allegorie*, 207-208; Butler, *Originality*, 150.

origin of inclusio and chiasmus have been widely deployed.[37] Careful definition of these terms has often been lacking and there have often been exaggerated claims made regarding them. It is probably best to recognize that the term 'inclusio' in Synoptic criticism is used of any resumptive note which seems to have a functional literary interest in micro- and macro-structures, and resulting from any kind of process, oral or literary. It may have a mnemonic or clarificatory usefulness, for example in the shaping of an answer to match an initial question.[38] Defined in that way, it is fairly frequent in all of the Synoptic Gospels, and it would be unwise to build editorial theories upon its occurrences. A classic case of this general use is Mk 12:27, where the feature is present in Mark but absent in Matthew; Matthew omits the precise words (πολὺ πλανᾶσθε Mk 12:27b Diff Mt 22:32) which provide the resumptive note (Mk 12:24 πλανᾶσθε Par Mt 22:29). A specialized form of this more general phenomenon is where the repetition is substantial, exact and signalled by literary means, such as Particles. There are Matthean examples of this which are distinctive within the Synoptic corpus; they are very limited in number and they belong to a post-Q paraenetic stratum, e.g. Mt 7:16-19.

Inclusio needs to be distinguished from chiasmus, the 'mirror' ordering of material. Here also it is probably right to make a general distinction: on the one hand, we can identify the general use of chiasmus, which the comparative evidence, produced by 'structuralist' enquiry, has shown to be sufficiently frequent in all stages of the New Testament material to make authorial judgments on the redactional use of chiasmus impossible to sustain;[39] this can be distinguished from the more specific and consistent use of chiasmus relating to particular poetic or high literary forms,[40] which has been more often claimed in respect of Luke than in respect of Matthew and Mark.[41] Mt 13:13-18 is an exception,[42] but even this Matthean passage belongs to the general use of chiasmus, since the last phrase of Mt 13:15, καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς, does not belong to the chiastic pattern and does not stand at the point where the images reverse. What

[37] See p.29.

[38] For the inadequacy of various definitions and a usage survey, see pp.25-28.

[39] Di Marco, *Chiasmus*.

[40] Bailey, *Lucan Parables*, 58ff.

[41] Corresponding to the observation that the Matthean tradition alone has examples of internally parallel structures is the hypothesis that Luke's parables are characterized by internal chiastic structures. These two distinctive kinds of parabolic structure point to two distinct areas of parabolic development between which there does not appear to have been any interaction.

[42] Contrast the frequency in Luke: see Bailey, *Lucan Parables*, 212, *Poet and Peasant*, 134ff.

mirror effects can be found in Mt 13:14-15 are pre-Matthean,[43] as are the 'chiastic' elements in 13:13,14a,14b/13:16,17a,17b; they include the pre-Matthean Q material Mt 13:16-17/Lk 10:23-24, and are probably the result of the compilation of internally structured material rather than the result of the composition of a new literary unit.[44] Since elsewhere Matthew destroys or lacks chiastic forms (e.g. Mt 7:7-11/Lk 11:9-13), the judgment that Mt 13:13-18 is a compilatory and incomplete chiasmus would seem justified.[45]

To sum up on the chapter as a whole: Mt 13 is an extension of the Marcan outline and its context, producing a unique literary form; particularly interesting in this form is the relationship of the smaller parts to the whole: the loose and the compilatory character of the discourse. That feature of the text needs now to be discussed in the light of an analysis of its separate parts.

A. *The Sower* Mt 13:1-9 and pars

(i) *The Context*

The introduction to the parable of *The Sower* in Matthew begins with a verse (Mt 13:1) which is tradition and not redaction.[46] It continues with a

---

[43] For the background to this, see pp.270-273.

[44] Bailey, *Lucan Parables*, 134ff.

[45] This loose and compilatory approach to Matthean redaction sets particular problems of method for structuralists attempting to identify deep structures behind Mt 13 which might reveal features of the original author's setting or intention. See Marin, *Matthieu 13:1-23*; Patte, *Matthew*.

[46] ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ. See p.13 n.14.

Mt 3x: 1x No Par; 2x Diff Mk

Mk 2x: 1x > ; 1 >*Mt (Mk 4:35)

Lk 3x: 1x No Par; 2x Diff Mt

ἐξελθών + Genitive.

A unique usage, with this case only, in the Synoptic Gospels. There are textual variants in Mt 13:1, incorrectly rendered by Nestle and Aland, reliably in Legg, *Matthew*. The shorter reading is harder and well attested and does seem to be a simple scribal error. In other uses of ἐξέρχομαι in Matthew there are variant readings (e.g. 27:53); none includes a Genitive only.

ἐξέρχομαι Schenk, *Sprache*, 256-258. On the Participle, see Hartman, *Testimonium Linguae*, 29, pace Schenk.

Mt	45x:	16x No Par; 10x Par Mk; 6x Par Lk; 9x Diff Mk (3x Diff ἐκπορεύομαι); 2x Diff Lk; 2x Text?
Mk	39x:	10x Par Mt; 8x > Mt; 15x > ; 5x Diff Mt; 1x Text?
Lk	44x:	20x No Par; 13x Par Mk; 6x Par Mt; 4x Diff Mk; 1x Diff Mt (Diff πορεύομαι)
Mt	with ἐκ 5x:	2x No Par; 3x Diff Mk (=3x Par Mk ἐκ)

	with ἀπὸ	5x:	1x Par Mk (Mk > ἀπὸ); 1x Par Lk; 2x Diff Mk; 1x Diff Lk
	with ἐκεῖθεν	2x:	1x Diff Mk; 1x Par Lk
	with εἰς(1)	6x:	1x Diff Mk; 4x Par Mk; 1x No Par
	with εἰς(2)	3x:	2x No Par; 1 x Diff Mk (All εἰς [ἀπ]άντησιν)
	with ἐπὶ	1x:	1x Par Mk
	with ἔξω	3x:	2x Par Mk (1x ἔξω >*Mk); 1x Par Lk
Mk	with ἐκ	10x:	4x > ; 4x > Mt; 1x >*Mt; 1x Diff Mt
	with ἀπὸ	1x:	1x Diff Mt (Diff Mt ἀπελθοῦσαι ἀπὸ)
	with ἐκεῖθεν	2x:	2x Diff Mt (1x=Mt ἐκεῖθεν)
	with εἰς	5x:	4x Par Mt; 1x >
	with παρὰ	1x:	1x Diff Mt
	with ἐπὶ	1x:	1x Par Mt
	with ἔξω	1x:	1x >*Mt
Lk	with ἀπὸ	13x:	3x No Par; 3x Par Mk (=Diff Mk ἐκ); 1x Par Mt; 6x Diff Mk
	with ἐκεῖθεν	2x:	1x Par Mk; 1x Par Mt
	with εἰς	5x:	3x No Par; 1x Par Mk; 1x Diff Mk

ἐκάθητο παρὰ + Accusative.

κάθημαι Schenk, *Sprache*, 313; Gundry, *Matthew*, 644; Gaston, *Horae Synopticae*, 62.

Mt	19x:	4x No Par; 6x Par Mk; 2x Par Lk, 5x Diff Mk; 1x Diff Mk or No Par; 1x Diff Mk or Par Lk
Mk	11x:	6x Par Mt; 4x > ; 1x Diff Mt
Lk	13x:	3x No Par; 5x Par Mk; 2x Diff Mk; 2x Par Mt; 1x Diff Mt

ἐκάθητο

Mt	4x:	3x Diff Mk; 1x Diff Mk or No Par
Mk	2x:	1x > ; 1x Diff Mt
Lk	2x:	1x Par Mk; 1x Diff Mk

κάθημαι παρὰ

Mt	2x:	1x Par Mk; 1x Diff Mk (13:1)
Mk	1x:	1x Par Mt (10:46 ἐκάθητο)
Lk	1x:	1x Par Mk (=Mk 10:46)

παρὰ + Accusative Schenk, *Sprache*, 399.

Mt	7x:	5x No Par; 1x Diff Mk; 1x > ;
Mk	7x:	5x Par Mt; 2x > ;
Lk	13x:	8x No Par; 3x Par Mk; 2x Diff Mk (1x Diff πρὸς + Accusative; 1x >*).

The Marcan tradition at 4:1 reads: καὶ πάλιν ἤρξατο διδάσκειν

Schenk, *Sprache*, 397; Gundry, *Matthew*, 647.

καὶ πάλιν

Mt	17x:	5x No Par; 5x Par Mk; 3x Diff Mk; 4x Diff Lk
Mk	28x:	5x Par Mt; 8x > ; 13x >*; 2x Diff Mt or >*
Lk	3x:	1x Par Mk; 2x Diff Mt

ἤρξατο Schenk, *Sprache*, 58; Gundry, *Matthew*, 642; see p.31 n.37.

Mt	13x:	4x No Par; 6x Par Mk; 2x Par Lk; 1x Diff Mk
Mk	28x:	6x Par Mt; 2x > Mt; 14x > ; 4x Diff Mt
Lk	31x:	21x No Par; 2x Par Mt; 3x Diff Mk; 5x Diff Mt

διδάσκειν Schenk, *Sprache* 183.

Mt	14x:	6x No Par; 6x Par Mk; 2x Diff Mk

reference to the extent of the public teaching of Jesus (see the relative positions of πολλά[47] and ἐν παραβολαῖς in Mt 13:3 and Mk 4:2), a reference which corresponds to Mt 13:34f. The parable is followed by a formulaic phrase in Mt 13:10,[48] which confirms the traditional character of

---

Mk 17x: 6x Par Mt; 5x > ; 2x > Mt; 2x >*; 2x Diff Mt
Lk 17x: 12x No Par; 2x Par Mk; 1x Diff Mk; 1x Diff Mt; 1x Text?
Conclusions:
1) There are signs of traditional usage in Mt 13:1 and no signs of Matthean redaction; 2) Elsewhere πάλιν and ἤρξατο pass from Mark into the Matthean narrative (see ch.6 n.228); there are clear signs of a Marcan preference for πάλιν and ἤρξατο.

[47] πολύς Schenk, *Sprache*, 416; Gaston, *Horae Synopticae*, 80.
Mt 53x: 8x No Par; 14x Par Mk; 14x Diff Mk; 5x Par Lk; 8x Diff Lk; 1x No Par or Diff Mk; 3x Text?
Mk 57x: 14x Par Mt; 7x > ; 13x > Mt; 9x >*; 14x Diff Mt
Lk 51x: 27x No Par; 7x Par Mk; 5x Diff Mk; 5x Par Mt; 2x Diff Mt; 4x No Par or Diff Mt; 1x No Par or Diff Mk
πολλὰ following a Verb:
Mt 3x: 1x No Par; 2x Par Mk
Mk 16x: 2x Par Mt; 4x > ; 4x > Mt; 3x >*; 3x Diff Mt
Lk 4x: 2x No Par; 1x Par Mk; 1x Diff Mt or No Par
Mt 9:14 is textually uncertain (see Mt Text? above); although Diff Mk, in the light of the above statistics it would probably be considered traditional. In 13:3 the reorganization of the material and reordering of the words emphasizes the range of the teaching given.

[48] The traditional character of the verse requires comment:
(i) προσελθόντες.
This is a very significant item in Matthean vocabulary: Schenk, *Sprache*, 258-259; Gundry, *Matthew*, 647; Held, *Wundergeschichten*, 215ff; Edwards, *Matthew*, 265-269; Edwards, *Gospel*, 67-74; Hartman, *Testimonium Linguae*, 30.
1. Hartman's findings:
'We can record a tendency in Matthew to use these favoured words in conjunctive participles without adjuncts i.e. to give them the semblance of formulae, somewhat faded in their meaning' (30). By favoured words Hartman means: ἐλθὼν and compounds, ἰδὼν, ἀκούσας, πορευθεὶς. 'In Mt(/Mk) Mt displays a certain homogenising tendency in his conjunctive participles, both as regards type and vocabulary, a tendency which becomes clearer in MT' (In Hartman's work Mt(/Mk)=our Mt Diff Mk; MT=our Mt No Par).
2. The main statistics:
προσέρχομαι
Mt 52x: 9x No Par; 3x Par Mk; 27x Diff Mk; 6x Diff Lk; 3x No Par or Diff Mk; 2x No Par or Diff Lk; 2x Text?
Mk 6x: 3x Par Mt; 1x > ; 1x >*Mt; 1x Text?
Lk 11x: 5x No Par; 1x Par Mk; 4x Diff Mk; 1x Text?
Aorist Active Participle
Mt 28x: 4x No Par; 1x Par Mk; 14x Diff Mk (2x=Par Lk); 5x Diff Lk; 3x No Par or Diff Mk; 1x No Par or Diff Lk
Mk 6x: 1x Par Mt; 1x > ; 1x >*; 2x Diff Mt; 1x Text?

Lk 6x: 2x No Par; 3x Diff Mk; 1x Par Mt
On ἐξέρχομαι, see n.36 above.
On ἀπέρχομαι
Mt 35x: 16x No Par; 4x Par Mk; 12x Diff Mk; 2x Par Lk; 1x Diff Lk
Mk 21x: 3x Par Mt; 1x > ; 7x > Mt; 9x Diff Mt
Lk 21x: 5x No Par; 5x Par Mk; 4x Diff Mk (=1x Par Mt); 2x Par Mt; 3x Diff Mt; 2x Text?
Aorist Active Participle
Mt 12x: 6x No Par; 2x Par Mk; 4x Diff Mk
Mk 5x: 2x Par Mt; 2x > ; 1x >
Lk 7x: 1x Par Mk; 3x Diff Mk; 3x Diff Mt

From these statistics it is clear that προσελθὼν is a special case; it is also clear that the Mk Diff Mt and Lk Diff Mt elements do not support a simple judgment of redactional preference.

3. There are patterns in the uses of προσέρχομαι. The sentence structures of which they are a part illustrate how certain patterns recur and develop. Here are six illustrations (the following abbreviations are used: π=προσέρχομαι; π=προσέρχομαι in a participial form; d(p)=Pronoun in Dative; N=subject; P=Participle; G=Genitive Absolute; g=Genitive Pronoun; pr=prepositional phrase; k=Conjunction; a=Adverb).

(i)	πNVd(p) Mt	8:19 (+ καὶ) Diff Lk; 13:10 Diff Mk (+ καὶ); 15:12 (+ τότε) No Par; 18:21 Diff Lk (+ τότε); 28:18 No Par (+ καὶ + λέγων)
(ii)	πd(p)NP Mt	9:14 (+ τότε) Diff Mk; 14:15 (+ G) Diff Mk (Mk and Lk have π); 15:30 (+ καὶ)) Diff Lk; 26:7 Diff Mk; 26:69 (+ καὶ) Diff Mk
	πd(p)NggprPP	20:20 (+ τότε) Diff Mk
(iii)	πdV	21:28 No Par; 21:30 (+ δὲ) No Par; 26:49 (+ καὶ) Par Mk. See 27:58
	πdpV	19:16 (+ καὶ ἰδοὺ) Diff Mk
(iv)	prπd(p)N	Several are + G: 8:5; 21:23; 24:3 (see also 17:24); Some extend the pattern: 9:28 (+kV); 17:14 (+PkP); 17:24 (+kV); 21:23 (+kNP); 24:3 (+aP); Some vary the pattern: 26:73 (π added to Mark)
(v)	πkP(N)V	This belongs to a single parable: 25:20,22,24
(vi)	πV	This includes 26:50 and 28:2 (both π VkV); 28:9 (+ δὲ + p)

Some of these are based on patterns found elsewhere in the Synoptics:
(i) see Mk 10:2 (par Lk 9:12); also Acts 22:27.
(iii) see Mk 14:45; also Mt 27:58=Lk 23:52 both Diff Mk.
These could be taken as evidence for Hartman's homogenizing tendency.

4. The meaning of προσέρχομαι.

Edwards (*Gospel*) argues on the basis of LXX and Hellenistic uses that this Verb signals the messianic character of Jesus in the First Gospel, and where Jesus is subject of the Verb the first step in messianic activity as the exalted Lord

Mt 13:1-3: there is no narrative sequence implied. Taken literally, Mt 13:1-3,10 would involve the disciples walking on the water! The context of *The Sower* in Matthew, then, is a highly traditional setting for a narrative of public proclamation.

(ii) *The Redaction*

There is no feature of the vocabulary or syntax of Mt 13:4-8 which can with certainty be described as redactional,[49] and attempts to argue for redactional

---

empowers his followers. There are weaknesses in Edwards's linguistic case. There is no doubt that προσέρχομαι is used of approaching the sanctuary, the holy man or the ruler. But, like the English phrase 'come forward', it has special associations linked with specific life-settings but also general uses as an Auxiliary Verb: 'he came forward and peered into the well'. The LXX gives ample evidence of this. The following examples from the LXX cannot be regarded as having sacral overtones (they are mainly where the Hebrew was originally קוב גור שוב): Gen 29:10; 33:14; 42:44; 1 Kgs 7:13; 17:40; 2 Kgs 1:15; 10:13; Ps 90(91)10; Sir 9:13; 21:2; Jonah 1:6; Dan Sus. 19,39; also Jud 12:15; 1 Macc 2:16,18,23; 2 Macc 2:6; 6:20; 4 Macc 18:14. There are similar examples from Aquila and Symmachus also.

The over-use of the Verb in Matthew may be part of a weakening of the sense of the Verb to which Hartman points and which the above formulae illustrate. The explanation for the over-use, for the wider range of formulae in relation to the Verb in Matthew than in Luke and Mark, and for the greater Matthean use than is evident in the case of the other -ερχομαι compounds, might be sought in the character of memorized narrative recall.

This is not to say that προσέρχομαι never carries the associations of approach to the holy and the honoured. It is to suggest that those associations are special cases, marked by Verbs such as γονυπετέω, προσκυνέω and on some occasions παρακαλέω; they are not the rule by which the general uses are to be understood.

διὰ τί

Mt 7x: 3x Par Mk; 3x Diff Mk; 1x Diff Lk
Mk 3x: 3x Par Mt
Lk 5x: 1x No Par; 1x Par Mk; 2x Diff Mk; 1x Diff Mt

In Mt 9:11 Luke agrees with Mt against Mark. In Mt 13:10 Luke agrees with Matthew against Mark in the use of the Interrogative Particle. Mt 15:3 Diff Lk follows the Interrogative in 15:2 Par Mk. The expression is a traditional formulation of direct speech.

λαλῶ Schenk, *Sprache*, 330; Gundry, *Matthew*, 645.

Mt 25x: 4x No Par; 9x Par Mk; 9x Diff Mk; 2x Par Lk; 1x Diff Lk
Mk 19x: 9x Par Mt; 5x > ; 2x > Mt; 1x >*; 2x Diff Mt
Lk 31x: 23x No Par; 4x Par Mk; 1x Diff Mk; 2x Par Mt; 1x Diff Mt

Note the agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark: μαθηταὶ and the Interrogative.

[49] There are three features needing discussion here:

(i) The Articular Infinitive: τοῦ σπείρειν Mt 13:3 Diff Mk/Par Lk
ἐν τῷ σπείρειν Mt 13:4 Par Mk and Lk

The Articular Infinitive

Mt 21x: 10x No Par; 4x Par Mk; 6x Diff Mk (=4x Par Lk); 1x Par Lk

features have led to contraditions within the argument, e.g. the claim that 13:4 avoids parataxis as a redactional technique is contradicted by 13:8 Par Mk/Diff Lk, and an omission such as καρπὸν οὐκ ἔδωκεν by Mt 13:7/Lk 8:7 (as against Mk 4:7), which touches the centre of Matthean theology, has often remained without comment. This latter omission is far too important to pass over, for literary as well as for theological reasons, since its omission by Matthew destroys the Marcan threefold parallelism (each of its sections is subdivided into three), a parallelism sometimes claimed to be an original feature of the parable.[50] Matthew's interest in parallelism within the structure of parables has been noted, for example, in 7:25-27. Yet here Matthew destroys it without any apparent reason. The best way to avoid these kinds of contradiction is to recognize that differences between Matthew and Mark may not be due to redaction but to tradition, and that this is an appropriate explanation in the case of the Matthean version of *The Sower.*

Matthew's version of the parable ends with a descending order of seed yield. This divergence from the Marcan tradition fits well with Matthew's concern, already noted in the context of Mt 13, that the powers of evil could

---

Mk 12x: 4x Par Mt; 1x > ; 2x > Mt; 1x >*; 3x Diff Mt; 1x Text?
Lk 62x: 38x No Par; 17x Diff Mk; 1x Par Mt; 5x Diff Mt; 1x No Par or Diff Mt

The Articular Infinitive with the Genitive τοῦ
Mt 6x: 3x No Par; 2x Diff Mk (=Par Lk); 1x Par Lk
Lk 15x: 9x No Par; 1x Par Mk; 3x Diff Mk; 2x Diff Mt

with ἐν
Mt 3x: 1x No Par; 2x Diff Mk (=1x Par Lk)
Lk 29x: 17x No Par; 11x Diff Mk; 1x Diff Mt

with διὰ
Mt 3x: 1x No Par; 2x Par Mk;
Mk 5x: 2x Par Mt; 3x > ;
Lk 6x: 3x No Par; 1x Diff Mk; 1x Diff Mt; 1x No Par or Diff Mt

The Articular Infinitive is used against ἵνα in Synoptic parallels:
Mt 1x Diff Mk; Lk 1x Diff Mt (Diff Mk)

The Articular Infinitive is used against ὥστε in Synoptic parallels:
Mk 2x Diff Mt;

The Articular Infinitive is used against ὅπως in Synoptic parallels:
Mk 1x Diff Mt. It would appear that there was an increase in the use of the Articular Infinitive in the post-Marcan phase of the Synoptic tradition, and that this phase affected the Matthean and Lucan uses of Marcan material; however, that influence is described in terms of the history of the tradition. The Articular Infinitive with Prepositions interchanged with other consecutive and purpose clauses. Of the 21 uses of the Articular Infinitive in Matthew there are 6 which come from ch. 13, as against 2 in the comparable Marcan and Lucan chapters. Mt 6:1 and Mt 23:5 have the same form: πρὸς τὸ θεαθῆναι + Dative (both No Par).
(ii) On ἐπὶ, see ch.6 n.1.
(iii) See also Neirynck, *Minor Agreements*, 87-88.

[50] Klauck, *Allegorie*, 188-189.

pose a danger to Christian commitment and obedience. Mark was not unaware of the dangers facing the Christian disciple; but Matthew gave them a more prominent place.[51]

(iii) *The Tradition*

The origin and original significance of *The Sower* is not with certainty recoverable. We cannot even be sure of its original form: was it originally a three- or a four-section narration? If it was a four-section narration, then most probably it was a meditation on four different ways of hearing the proclamation of Jesus.[52] That would leave open the question of whether it was a meditation by Jesus himself or by the Early Church. If it was a three-section narration, then the reduction of available versions to a threefold basic outline might offer a promising starting-point.[53] Even so, the original meaning of the parable of *The Sower* may not be recoverable: agricultural and linguistic arguments used to define the meaning of the parable as told by Jesus are unconvincing;[54] the picture used, with its philosophical, rhetorical, poetic and existential associations,[55] is not easily circumscribed; and the method used by some scholars, of identifying the force of the parable by reference to eschatological interpretations of the teaching of Jesus, has obvious disadvantages. Klauck, for example, having noted the paraenetic, rabbinic, apocalyptic and apologetic uses of 'seed', then narrows the reference of the parable by placing a question mark, characteristic of Jesus in Klauck's view, over strictly temporal views of the Kingdom's accessibility.[56] Even the significance of the hundredfold yield, characteristic of the third section of the parable, is open to doubt. Some regard it as an oustanding result; for others, on good evidence from the world contemporary with Jesus, a hundredfold yield is unsurprising; in that case, all that remains in the surviving outline as worthy of comment is that the narrator should refer to failure at all.[57] Was, then, the parable concerned with the miracle of divine work in failure and in the ordinariness of everyday life? One advantage of such a view of *The Sower* would of course be that Matthew's adjustment to the conclusion of the parable, with its descending scale of produce, would be nearer than we might have suspected to the tone of the original. Or was it a fiction stressing chance and uncertainty, and therefore resonating with

---

[51] See Davies, *Matthew*, II 385, for alternative explanations of the descending order of yield.

[52] Hahn, *Mk iv.3-8*, 133-142; Luz, *Matthäus*, 1/2 308.

[53] Scott, *Parable*, 350.

[54] White, *Sower*, 300; Payne, *Sower*, 123-129; Scott, *Parable*, 353; Carlston, *Triple Tradition*, 146-148.

[55] Wilder, *Sower*, 134ff.

[56] Klauck, *Allegorie*, 192ff; Luck, *Sämann*.

[57] Scott, *Parable*, 356-358.

impiety against the Deuteronomic background (Deuteronomy 11:13-21), which saw harvest as a divine blessing and reward?[58] In that case, Matthew's version would have weakened the 'reversal' element in the original parable: hazards, danger, good luck, success became hazards, danger, bad luck, failure.

The ambiguity of narrative discourse in *The Sower*, with its central pictures of seed and harvest, is also evident in the variant Gospel forms of the parable of *The Sower*, their translations and versions. The variations between the Gospel versions are not so great, nor so clearly motivated, as to require those variations to be attributed to specific teachers or theologians. Yet within the contexts to be assumed for Mark, Luke and Thomas,[59] it is possible to hear the narrative in different ways, sometimes through, sometimes even despite, these variations.[60] Even where, as in the case of Matthew, the Gospel offers in the Interpretation of *The Sower* a guide as to how the narrative may be heard, the narrative does not always seem to correspond exactly in every respect to that guide. The narrative has at least a degree of independence and a measure of ambiguity over against the Interpretations of *The Sower*, partly the result no doubt of Matthew's sources. The reasons for this will appear later.

With respect to the place of Matthew in the tradition of *The Sower*, one point is clear. The strength of Matthew's narration of *The Sower* is this: that disappointment and failure are possible. That makes it distinctive within the Synoptic tradition. It may be paralleled in the Thomas tradition in so far as failure may be a result, according to GThom, of the hold which evil possesses over physical and material reality.[61] Failure in Mark and Luke can signal the hiddenness of the Kingdom. In Matthew failure is at least in part a possibility to be feared, not as an inhibiting fear, and certainly not a fear which is an inevitable part of daily life. Failure is to be feared because of the profound consequences for individual and community life that might follow from failure.[62]

---

[58] Hedrick, *Poetic Fictions*, 164-186.

[59] Schrage, *Thomas-Evangeliums*, 42ff; Sheppard, *Thomas*, 147-154; Fieger, *Thomas*, 54; Ménard, *Thomas*, 92ff.

[60] The absence of καρπὸν οὐκ ἔδωκεν (Mk 4:7b) from Matthew and Luke, both of whom value the ethical implications of the narrative (see Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium*, 457), illustrates an extreme case of the narrative being heard in a particular way despite its textual form.

[61] Fieger, *Thomas*, 285f.

[62] In Mark's Gospel failure in mission may be seen as a feature of this age as contrasted with the future glory revealed to the followers of Christ; in Luke failure in mission calls particularly for perseverance (Thiering, *Breaking of Bread*, 9ff; Dupont, *Semeur*, 109). In Matthew, although weakness and powerlessness may be judged by the eternal values of the Kingdom, failure in

(iv–v) *The History of the Parables and the History of Redaction*

The parable of *The Sower* would seem to be a discourse built using emblematic metaphors, and a narrative capable of a measure of artistic autonomy.[63] It would seem therefore inadvisable to accept a definition of parabolic speech which denies either the one or the other.[64] The history of its use would appear to have resulted from an openness to interpretation afforded by both factors.

The narration of the parable in Matthew, although in many respects open to various interpretations, concludes in a manner which matches the function of Mt 13 as a whole. In Mt 13 the Old Testament quotations and the dialogue about the nature of parables concentrate the reader's attention on response and failure to respond, on privilege and responsibility. The final verse of the Matthean parable of *The Sower* is appropriate to that overall scheme.

The placing of *The Sower* within the history of redaction is as differently evaluated by scholars as its placing within the environment and personal history of Jesus of Nazareth. Bornkamm argues that Matthew understood the purpose of parables to be an in-breaking of the Kingdom which the parable of *The Sower* instantiates.[65] Kingsbury thinks that Matthew credits the disciples with insights before Easter which other Gospels allow for only after Easter, whereas the Jews are blind, both before and after. This, he maintains, is implied in *The Sower* and made explicit in vv10-17.[66] Dupont does not accept this identification of 'disciples' with 'Christians', but sees the parable and vv10-17 as noting the reason for deafness to the good news. It is a matter of the hearer's attitude.[67] Gerhardsson thinks that Matthew is working with a 'hearing–doing' schema, and the hearing of parables is therefore an enriching process, giving insight into the strange elusive nature of grace in 13:8b which, beyond all human expectations, is a key to the mysteries of God.[68] Luz, as we have seen, leaves open the question of the origin of the parable and sees the Matthean version as, like the Marcan form, avoiding the extremities of optimism or pessimism.[69] Although the final phrase of the Matthean parable raises the question of failure, these responses place the Matthean emphasis in its wider context.

---

mission would be a denial of divine sovereignty, and moral failure would similarly be fraught with fearful possibilities (13:42,50).

[63] For the view that the poetry in Mark and Matthew is roughly similar, see Hedrick, *Parable*, 179-183.

[64] Thompson, *Critical Hermeneutics*, 50ff.

[65] Bornkamm: the phrase he used in his 1960 lectures on Matthew's Gospel.

[66] Kingsbury, *Parables*, 36f and 51.

[67] Dupont, *Paraboles*, 235f.

[68] Wilkens, *Redaktion*, 308ff.

[69] Luz, *Matthäus*, 1/2 310.

The metaphors used by Matthew, and not least the agricultural pictures, provide pointers to the divine in-breaking of God's work in Jesus Christ (see the wider context provided by 12:18-21). In the generations of parabolic use and interpretation which follow the initial narration of *The Sower* that perspective should not be obscured.

To conclude: *The Sower* is related to its Matthean context in two distinct ways: in one respect it is drawn from Matthew's source as an independent narration; in another it warns against all that debilitates the Christian presence and mission. The context of the parable and the Interpretation of *The Sower* identify this danger with the power of evil, giving the parable a paraenetic force. As part of the context of ch. 13 as a whole, the parable reveals the gracious stimulus and strength which belongs to the proclamation of the Kingdom of Heaven, and the care and attention which is required from everyone who enjoys its privileges. Much is expected from those to whom much is given (see 13:12; 25:29); and judgment on those who do not respond will follow (13:11-15). This encouraging but uncompromising message is linked with the proclamation of God's Son (13:3f). This is the Son who will not snap the broken reed, nor snuff out the smouldering wick (12:20). The parable in that way mirrors both the privileges and the responsibilities of Christian living. The privileges are stated with fresh candour (13:16-17); and so are the challenges.

B. *The Interpretation of The Sower*

(i) *The Context*

The alternative between high privilege and the fear of poor results which is characteristic of Mt 13:1-9 continues in 13:10ff. Mt 13:16-17, the addition from Q held over by Matthew for use at this point because of its reference to 'seeing' and 'hearing', stresses the privilege of knowing that for which prophets and righteous men longed (Mt 13:16/Lk 10:23f).[70] This is balanced in 13:18-23, the Interpretation of *The Sower*, with a series of warnings.

One background to 13:18-23 is the pattern of interpretation which we know of from the Jewish Vision Interpretations[71] (see Zech 4:11ff). A pointer to this kind of Allegorese in 13:18-23 is the use of the Pronouns; these indicate that specific elements from the picture are to be identified with particular interpretations.[72] Other pointers are the mixing of referential

[70] Manson, *Sayings*, 80.

[71] Lemcio, *Structure*, 326ff; Klauck, *Allegorie*, 201; see also p.78 and n.58.

[72] For the Demonstrative Pronoun in Vision Interpretations, see LXX Zech 4:10; 5:3; 6:5; Daniel 7:17; Hermas Vis 3.4.1-2; 3.5.5; 3.6.1-3. In Mark these

elements with picture features of the original, and variations within the interpretative tradition[73] (oral or written).[74] In two particular respects the context of the Interpretation of *The Sower* in the Synoptic Gospels may have been influenced by that background: the mention of μυστήριον (Mk 4:11)/μυστήρια (Mt 13:11/Lk 8:10)[75] recalls the association of the Vision Interpretations with God's revelation (see Dan 4:17ff), and a sequence of events found both in Vision Interpretations and in Mt 13:1-23/Mk 4:1-20/Lk 8:4-15. The sequence of events runs as follows: 1) an ambiguous picture, 2) incomprehension, 3) a critical rejoinder and 4) an explanation.[76]

It has to be said that the first of those features, the use of μυστήριον in Mark, μυστήρια in Matthew and Luke, is open to many different interpretations and could belong to any one of several contexts.[77] In Mark μυστήριον seems to have three interrelated elements: it is a divine revelation recognized now by a few but at the end to be revealed universally; it is the secret of Jesus' identity and of the breaking in of the Kingdom; it is private instruction based on Jesus' invitation to disciples to be with him, although not necessarily fully understood by them.[78] The plural μυστήρια in Matthew may share some or most of those elements, but the emphases may well have shifted: the universal proclamation of divine revelation seems to be happening already, notably in the challenge given to everyone in the parables to hear and repent (13:10-15,34-35: the μυστήρια are parallel to κεκρυμμένα ἀπὸ καταβολῆς), a challenge which includes narrative Visions of a Final Judgment. The secret of Jesus' identity is revealed, specifically his identity as the Son who makes clear the Father's will. The knowledge of the μυστήρια (ὑμῖν δέδοται γνῶναι: 13:11) is a high privilege but carries practical responsibilities too (13:23; 13:41). Within that particular context the Allegorese form of interpretation is serving a new purpose.

---

appear three times; in Matthew it concludes the section, as in Lk 8:14,15 Par Mt Diff Mk. See n.81 below.

[73] For the mixing of referential elements and picture elements in Vision Interpretations, see Zech 4:14; 5:4,11 LXX. For variations within the tradition of Vision Interpretations, see Zech 4:12 LXX, where extensions to the basic picture are introduced.

[74] For a form-critical approach to Vision Interpretations, see Kearns, *Vorfragen*, II 17ff.

[75] See also Daniel 2:27-30 (LXX, Theodotion).

[76] For a different approach to the stages behind Mt 13, see Cerfaux, *La connaissance*, 238ff.

[77] See Orton, *Scribe*, 133.

[78] Tuckett, *Parables*, 15-22.

(ii) *The Redaction*

Despite all that has been written about the Interpretation of *The Sower* it is a surprising fact that there is no entirely satisfactory survey of all three of its versions. Very little attention has been paid to the relation of the Matthean Interpretation to the Marcan text of the parable,[79] or to a comparison of the three versions of the Interpretation, or to the relations of these to their respective parabolic texts. Yet in Mt 13:22 Matthew's Interpretation agrees with the Marcan text of the parable and with the Marcan Interpretation of the parable (e.g. συμπνίγω Mt 13:21=Mk 4:7; Mk 4:19=Lk 8:14), and agrees with them against Matthew's own parabolic text (e.g. Mt 13:7 ἀπέπνιξαν);[80] and Matthew's syntactical sentence-form, consistently used throughout Mt 13:19-23, agrees against Mark with Lk 8:14-15 exactly, and with Lk 8:12-13 very closely,[81] and with the Interpretation of *The Tares* (Mt 13:37-39)[82] closely also.

The survey falls into two halves: there is an unexpectedly complicated pattern of agreements and disagreements between the three versions of the parable and the three versions of the Interpretation; the Marcan Interpretation has links with the Matthean parable and Interpretation against the text of the

---

[79] e.g. Wenham, *Structure*, 516-522.

[80] The key verses for comparison are: Mk 4:7,18f; Mt 13:8,22:
(i) εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας appears in Mt 13:22 Par Mk 4:18 and Lk 8:14, and in Mk 4:7 Diff Mt 13:7 (there are important variant readings here) and Diff Lk 8:7;
(ii) συμπνίγω appears in Mt 13:22 Par Mk 4:19, and in Mk 4:7 Diff Mt 13:7 (=Lk 8:7) (several MSS avoid the compound form of the Verb);
(iii) The failure to produce 'fruit' is noted in Mt 13:22 Par Mk 4:19, and in Mk 4:7 Diff Mt 13:7.
In all three examples Matthew's version of the Interpretation of *The Sower* agrees with the Marcan version of *The Sower* against the Matthean form of the parable; in all three examples Matthew's version of the Interpretation of *The Sower* agrees with the Marcan version of *The Sower* against the post-Marcan version of *The Sower* (see Mt 13:7=Lk 8:7 Diff Mk).

[81] The following abbreviations are used in the following summary: S=subject; d=demonstrative; V=Verb; P=predicate; A=ἄλλοι ; G=Genitive Absolute.

Mt 13:19-23	Mk 14:15-20	Lk 8:12-15
v19 S(G)dVP	v15 dVP	v12 SVP
v20 SdVP	v16 dVP	v13 SP
v22 SdVP	v18 AVPdVP	v14 SdVP
v23 SdVP	v20 dVP	v15 SdVP

[82] See Mt 13:37-39

v37	SVP
v38a	SVP
v38b	SdVP
v38c	SVP
v39a	S(+)VP
v39b	SPV
v39c	SPV

Marcan parable; the Lucan Interpretation agrees with the Marcan and Matthean parable and Interpretation against its own Lucan form of the parable; the Matthean and Lucan versions of the Interpretation agree against the Marcan, as their forms of the parable do; the Matthean and Lucan versions of the parables agree at points against Mark and against their versions of the Interpretations; all three versions of the Interpretation agree at points where all the versions of the parable disagree (e.g. on the Preposition used with τὰς ἀκάνθας).[83] That is only a preliminary set of observations. The total survey indicates that the synoptic variations here are so complex that they cannot satisfactorily be solved in terms of literary relationships alone.

The second half of the survey has to deal with the agreements of syntax and sentence-form between the Matthean and Lucan versions of the Interpretation, against the Marcan version. These are in many ways more significant than the vocabulary agreements against Mark, because they represent an additional range of agreement which has not hitherto been noted, and because they reveal in the consistent agreements between Matthew and Luke not simply occasional similar choices but an interpretative form which links Matthew and Luke against Mark.

Not only does the hypothesis of literary relationships fail to explain the first series of agreements and disagreements, it is also quite unsuited to dealing with this second series. One possibility is that the Interpretations circulated independently of the parable. Possibly the popularity of *The Sower* resulted in an unusually large number of independently circulating traditions of both parable and Interpretation. Significantly also this is what is to be found in the case of the Vision Interpretations (see Dan 7:13ff). A possible hypothesis in the case of *The Sower* might therefore be that the Marcan tradition of both the parable and its Interpretation underwent independent developments in the post-Marcan, pre-Matthean stage, and these developments continued, involving at least one Sitz im Leben in which the parable of *The Tares* became involved as well.

The redactional element in the Matthean Interpretation of *The Sower* is not easy to isolate if the above hypothesis is correct. Redaction becomes a method by which traditional elements are incorporated into a larger framework. The key features of the Matthean Interpretation can be assessed for their coherence with the Matthean context, but that is not the same as judging their distinctiveness as final redaction. For example, the links of thought, vocabulary and sentence structure between the Interpretation of *The Sower* and the Interpretation of *The Tares*[84] in Mt 13 suggest a degree of

[83] See p.301 n.70.

[84] Jeremias, *Parables*, 82-83, reviews 37 items in the Interpretation of *The Tares* and concludes that they represent a 'unique collection of the linguistic

coherence. But if this had already been established at a prior stage, it does not belong exclusively to the final redaction. In all probability, the common sentence structure of these two Interpretations, since it is common to Luke as well, could be due to a tradition, and this tradition could be non- or pre-Matthean.

There are two respects in which the Matthean Interpretation of *The Sower* focuses the Matthean context in ways which may be treated as Matthean

---

characteristics of the Evangelist Matthew'. De Goedt, *Matt.XIII:36-43*, concludes the opposite (correctly in our view), that they are mostly traditional. Three of the 37 items are common to the Interpretation of *The Sower* and the Interpretation of *The Tares*: they all three need attention:

1) The three so-called 'editorial links':

(i) ὁ πονηρὸς. See p.306 and Baumbach, *Bösen*, 57-63.

Barth, *Kirchenzucht*, assumes a difference between 13:19 and 13:39: in 13:39 divine permission is given for a dualism of good and evil to be a battlefield within the church. The Interpretation of *The Sower* lacks only the explicit reference to divine permission, although the Matthean form (p.306) betrays the different sources behind 13:19 and 13:39. (ii) βασιλεία. The absence of βασιλεία in vv20,22,23, the agreement between Matthew and Luke against Mark in the use of λόγος in Mt 13:19, and the association of Kingdom in 13:41 and 13:43 with 'Son of Man' and 'Father', combine to question Kingsbury's judgment that 'For Matthew the Word about the Kingdom is the Church's total message regarding Jesus' (*Parables*, 55). It is difficult to formulate a uniform redactional use for βασιλεία in Matthew (see p.199 n.88). (iii) παραβολὴ τῶν [τοῦ] 13:18/13:36f is not paralleled elsewhere in the Synoptic Gospels. The question is whether that similarity might belong with the similarity of form described on pp.303-304.

2) The style of the two Interpretations:

(i) Points of similarity: a) the catalogue use of δὲ in 13:23, 38f (see Lk 8:15 Diff Mk); b) the use of the SdVP formula; c) the variability of the tense of Participles used: see 13:19,22,23,37,39, and Mt 13:23 Par Mk 4:20 (Lk 8:13 omits), with σπείρω; d) a Noun with an attributive Adjective denoting quality placed between the Definite Article and the Noun: see 13:23,37 (also Lk 8:15 Diff Mk 4:20); e) the use of non-personal Nouns with people as their referents.

(ii) Points of dissimilarity: a) 13:38a indicates a lack of interest in the order of the original parable in providing a catalogue of Interpretations (contrast 13:23); b) 13:38b has a lack of correspondence between the number of the Demonstrative Pronoun and the Noun to which it refers (see Lk 8:14 Diff Mt); c) 13:38 has a neuter plural Noun as subject of a plural Verb; d) 13:39a has the formula S(+)PV; e) 13:39 uses paronomasia; f) 13:39b has an unusual Genitive qualifying an Anarthrous Noun (as predicate): Blass, Debrunner, Funk, *Grammar* §§259, 254(1)(2).

These relationships and dissimilarities are more consonant with a loose relationship within related traditions than with a relationship due to redactional style.

(iii) The links of 13:36-43 with other parts of ch. 13. The links between 13:36-43 and the parable of *The Net* are close, as are the links between *The Tares* and the Marcan parable of *The Seed Growing Secretly*. The relationship of 13:18- 23 and 13:36-43 has to be judged in the light of those closer similarities.

redaction: 13:23, with its Particle δή,[85] makes the connection between hearing and obedience, a connection fundamental to Matthew's Gospel (see Mt 7:24-27); and 13:19 makes the connection between this ethical interest and the Kingdom. This relationship is explicit in Mt 13:19; but even so,[86] 13:19 should not be treated simply as a piece of final redaction. Had the final redactor, as some claim, decided to clarify the imagery of the Interpretation,[87] he could have made vv19 and 23 into much closer parallels, and, by that means, given much greater clarity to the Interpretation; it would then have been abundantly evident that it was concerned only with the 'quality of the one who hears'. Instead, the opening phrase of Mt 13:19, as well as including traditional elements,[88] hints at the 'sowing of the word' as well as the receiving. The sowing and the receiving of the seed both retain the place which they have in the parable. This lack of 'a greater clarity' may make difficulties for the theory of authorial redaction. It poses no problems to the theory that, at various points in its history,[89] the Interpretation of *The Sower* has been affected by the tradition of Vision Interpretations.

Two distinctive elements in Mt 13:18-23 remain: the descending order of seed yield which ends the Interpretation of *The Sower* in Matthew, as it ended the Matthean form of the parable. Related to this is the use in the Interpretation of *The Sower* of ὁ πονηρὸς (Mt 13:19),[90] as against Mark's

---

[85] δή is unusual in the Synoptic Gospels (see Lk 2:15, where it is a secure reading and accompanies an exhortation). If it is read at Mt 13:23 (the 'Western' text has τότε; and some of the Syriac versions do not support δή), δή corresponds to the classical use (Blass, Debrunner, Funk, *Grammar* §451(4)). Its force is however not entirely clear. According to Barth, *Gesetzesverständnis*, 100 n.1, and Klauck, *Allegorie*, 207, δή is emphatic. But does it mean 'who is the just the person who' (Blass, Debrunner, Funk, *Grammar*, §235), or 'who is actually producing fruit' (as distinct from one who promises or intends to) (so Klauck; see Homer, *Iliad*, 21:315)? It could also, according to good classical usage, introduce a quotation (see Aeschylus, *Agamemnon*, 550, and Frankel's *Agamemnon Commentary*, II 277): 'who (to quote the parable) "produces fruit"'. Its general force is clear, if not its precise meaning: it draws attention to the quality of the one who is hearing and who is 'bearing fruit'.

[86] This is true of the Kingdom of Heaven sayings and of the absolute uses as in 6:33.

[87] Contra Kingsbury, *Parables*, 53.

[88] See Appendix No.19 for this highly unusual example of the Genitive Absolute.

[89] The delayed demonstrative and narrative explanation is paralleled in Dan 4:20 (Theodotion).

[90] πονηρὸς Schenk, *Sprache*, 161; Gundry, *Matthew*, 647.

Mt 26x: 9x No Par; 4x Diff Mk; 11x Par Lk; 2x Diff Lk
Mk 2x: 1x > ; 1x >*Mt
Lk 13x: 2x No Par; 11x Par Mt

σατανᾶς (Mk 4:15) and Luke's ὁ διάβολος (Lk 8:12).[91] 'Evil' has an important role in the Matthean material: it is the force which, beyond anything else, threatens failure.

Baumbach believes that this Matthean picture of the Evil One, threatening the life, order and obedience of the Christian community, is a more tightly constructed picture than Mark's, with strong similarities to the ethical dualism of the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs.[92] Whereas in Mark evil is a dark background to the life-giving work of the Son of God, with no clear relationship explicitly made between an evil originator and its agents, in Matthew, Baumbach argues, the Evil One is the summary of all evil and the battle against him is therefore rather less direct, since the evil that confronts the Son's disciples is mediated; it appears in the form of lying prophets, false teachers and ἀνομία.[93]

There is little doubt that the Son's disciples are in jeopardy. The stress in Matthew appears to be on the dangers experienced by them because of the powers of evil, rather than upon any control which evil might have established over the whole world. The threat of evil, weakening their resolve and destroying their moral perception, is the central concern. So despite the evidence of dualistic language in Matthew parallel to that found in the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, the key question to be answered is whether the redactor, in associating the Kingdom with moral responsibility and action, is as committed to a cosmic dualistic world-view as his some of his sources were, or whether the implied dualism had become modified in the process of the creation of the Gospel.[94] This is a particular issue in Matthew 13, and we shall note the various examples of dualistic language, especially in the parable of *The Tares* and in its Interpretation, and we shall

---

With the Definite Article

Mt 5x: 3x No Par; 1x Diff Mk; 1x Diff Lk

On the distinction between Eastern and Western interpretations of τοῦ πονηροῦ in Mt 6:13b, see Davies, *Matthew*, I 614-615. On ἐχθρὸς, see Baumbach, *Bösen*, 105.

[91] σατανᾶς

Mt 4x: 2x Par Mk; 1x Diff Lk; 1x Par Mk or Diff Mk

Mk 6x: 2x Par Mt; 1x > ; 2x Diff Mt (1x διάβολος; 1x πονηρὸς)

Lk 5x: 4x No Par; 1x Par Mk

διάβολος

Mt 6x: 2x No Par; 1x Par Lk; 2x Diff Lk (=2x >)
1x Par Lk or Diff Mk (σατανᾶς)

Lk 5x: 1x Diff Mk; 1 x Par Mt; 2x Diff Mt; 1x Par Mt or Diff Mk

ὁ πειράζων

Mt 1x Diff Lk (διάβολος); 1 Thess 3:5. See Baumbach, *Bösen*, 105.

[92] See Baumbach, *Bösen*, 69-72. As representing a false understanding of God's Law and misleading the ignorant, see Baumbach, *Bösen*, 83ff.

[93] Davison, *Anomia*, 617-635.

[94] Syreeni, *Symbolic Universe*, 10.

try to establish in each case what the redactor intended. In Mt 13:10-23 the privileges of discipleship are as evident as the dangers to which they are exposed. As in the case of the Beatitudes at the beginning of the Sermon on the Mount, so in 13:16-17 what is expected of the followers of Jesus is made possible by the new activity of God. The disciples have the powers at their service which are more than a match for the evil (see Mt 12:43-45/Lk 11:24-26). They represent the One whose sovereignty is eternal and universal, and whose Son bears the marks of victorious suffering until justice is established for all.

(iii) *The Tradition*

If the parallel of the Vision Interpretation is valid, the evidence for a pre-Greek source, sometimes drawn hypothetically from uneven elements in the Marcan Interpretation (especially Mk 4:16)[95] is weakened. The use of the LXX Interpretation-form and of key Greek terms in two out of the four categories of soil weakens the case further:

Category 2:	χαρὰ	1 Thess 1:6; Acts 8:6-8;[96]
	πρόσκαιρος	4 Macc 15:2,8,23;[97]
	θλῖψις	Rev 2:9,10,22; Ps 34:20.[98]
Category 3:	μέριμνα	1 Pet 5:7;
	ἀπάτη	2 Thess 2:10; Heb 3:13; Eph 4:22.

The most compelling arguments for a pre-Greek source rest on the possible use of Isaianic texts. Both parable and Interpretation could be a midrash on Isa 55:10-11[99] or could be based on the associations of hardening of heart and growth from the seed found in the Targum of Isaiah.[100] The strength of this case is that it makes sense of a dual interest in both the parable and the Interpretation: they begin with the sower, and end with the quality of the ground, or, in terms of the prophetic text, they begin with the divine word and end with the nature of those who hear it. The prophetic word discloses the true nature of those addressed, with the Interpretation shifting the emphasis toward the different kinds of reception.

---

95 Payne, *Interpretation*, 564-568.

96 Conzelmann, *TDNT*, 9.359ff; Klauck, *Allegorie*, 203.

97 Klauck, *Allegorie*, 203.

98 Schlier, *TDNT*, 3.319ff.

99 Evans, *Sower*, 464-468.

100 Bowker, *Mystery*, 310-311, also 316 for a discussion of possible Aramaic equivalents to πρόσκαιρος (e.g. קצר; but according to 11QtgJob (col. 18:5; col. 4:3) this may lack the 'transitory' connotations of πρόσκαιρος; it refers rather to 'hasty attitudes').

But even if there was a pre-Greek source, the Interpretation in our present text has given this emphasis upon the receptors of the word a specific twist. It has related the different kinds of reception presented in the parable to particular circumstances. Through the above-mentioned vocabulary the sowing of the seed is related in the Interpretation to the possibility of persecution, and to the temptations of anxiety and greed. The different reactions to the word presented in the parable are given in the Interpretation a specific, early Christian setting.

Is it possible to be more precise about the new Sitz im Leben? The Interpretation may well have been used in the pre-Marcan circumstances of early Christian mission. This could have been one where messengers, travelling from village to village, often deprived, always facing the danger of apostasy, were committed to the belief, even though their audience found their message enigmatic, that they alone had been given a grasp of the secrets of God's final purpose, and their modest beginnings would later yield amazing results.[101] The writer of Mark would then have used both parable and Interpretation in his advocacy of suffering obedience as the way to future glory, to encourage a community still dependent in part on such travelling messengers, and certainly facing either the reality or the possibility of persecution, or needing to be warned of that possibility. The λόγος which they proclaimed (Mk 4:14) continued to work within the locality and community[102] (see Mk 4:15) with very varied results. One possible outcome would certainly be that of rejection, and of rejection by Jewish neighbours. This rejection had its mysterious side, and itself called for an explanation in terms of the divine purpose and providence. Isaiah 6 was being fulfilled again. The obverse of this hardening of the heart would be persecution, recalling the narrative of the Marcan Passion[103] and the varying reactions of its participants.

Whatever nuances Mark may have given to this use of *The Sower*, there is little doubt that Luke took suffering and rejection to be the quintessentially necessary mode of witness.[104] That he interpreted the parable of *The Sower* in this light is clear from the characteristic ending of the Interpretation of the *The Sower* in Luke (Lk 8:15).[105] The Lucan interpretation concerned not

---

101 Kee, *Community*, 172ff.

102 On the interrelation of revelation and receptor implied in the use of λόγος, see Klauck, *Allegorie*, 201; Hahn, *Mk iv.3-8*, 14-20; Lambrecht, *Mk.IV*, 275 n.25.

103 Drury, *Parables*, 51.

104 Luke 9:5; Johnson, *Possessions*; Beck, *Luke*, 100.

105 Cerfaux, *Fructifiez*, 414-415; Dupont, *Semeur*, 107; Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium*, 464; Bovon, *Luc*, 405-407.

only persecution but all the different kinds of opposition and obstacles through which the church must pass on its way to the Kingdom.[106]

Alongside the likelihood of opposition and persecution were the internal struggles. Property, possessions, financial concerns, social status, the problems of town life and its attractions introduced another set of dynamics. These would have affected the internal organization of the Christian community and it would have caused internal disputes about standards of behaviour inside and outside the community. These are hinted at in Mk 4:19/Mt 13:22/Lk 8:14. Within the Matthean social context they became particularly important. There is one particular feature of ἀνομία with which the Interpretation of *The Sower* and *The Tares* was concerned: those within the community may, because of the pressures of society around them, lose their moral perception and sense of responsibility. Some found that environment destructive of Christian standards, others found their social environment to be precisely the place where their Christian responsibility had to be exercised. The ending of the Interpretation reflects those possibilities, both their dangers and their potential.

(iv–v) *The History of the Parables and the History of Redaction*

Only in Mk 7:14ff/Mt 15:10ff[107] and in Mt 13:24-30,36-43 are parallels to be found in the synoptic tradition to the parable of *The Sower* and its Interpretation. Mt 13:18-23 can hardly therefore be treated as paradigmatic for parabolic interpretation.[108] The tradition of such interpretation stretches back into the pre-Marcan stages of parabolic use, but there is no suggestion in that tradition that the parables were widely, let alone consistently, treated in this way. It may well be that the central 'model' of *The Sower*, itself so rich in associations, provided the stimulus for the use of interpretative methods. Perhaps the Sitz im Leben just described was part of the reason also. It may be that other factors, such as the interpretative patterns associated with charismatic exegesis, may have influenced the process, particularly at the point where the Matthean Interpretation of *The Sower* and the Interpretation of *The Tares* emerged. Whatever the various influences which may have been at work in the process, the limited use outside *The Sower* of this form of interpretation, and the varied traditions of its use in the case of *The Sower*, are significant factors in the history of parables.

---

106 Brown, *Perseverance*, 48-50.

107 Outside the synoptic tradition, features of this interpretative technique are to be found in the Johannine parables. In Jn 10:2-5 there is a chiastic παροιμία (see Jn 16:25) into which elements of the later Interpretation in Jn 10:6ff have been introduced; the context of this (see Jn 9:37) resembles Mk 4:10-13.

108 Klauck, *Allegorie*, 360.

The contrast between privilege and failure, which the Matthean Interpretation of *The Sower* presents, became in Matthew a paraenesis within a fresh framework. It is not altogether clear that the Interpretation should have been necessary for Matthew's purpose, particularly if its dualistic element was not entirely to Matthew's liking, nor why Matthew should have used this parable and its Interpretation in their traditional form alongside so many Kingdom parables. If the style of Allegorese is not paradigmatic, or not paradigmatic for Matthew, why should Matthew have retained it at all? That such interpretation had limited use outside *The Sower*, and was expressed in various ways within the case of *The Sower*, becomes, in the history of the parables, evidence for the style and method of Matthean redaction. It was compilatory and conservative.

In sum, Matthew uses in the Interpretation of *The Sower* a tradition paraenetically shaped and with strong dualistic roots, based on the style of Allegorese. In it Matthew highlights a particular understanding of what is involved in being a disciple of the Kingdom and a policy of conservation and reuse of traditional material.

C. *The Tares* Mt 13:24-30

(i) *The Context*

The parable of *The Tares*, like the previous parable in Matthew 13, concerns seed, and, like *The Sower*, seed whose growth may result in a harvest. But whereas in *The Sower* the growth of some seed may be inhibited by weeds growing alongside the young plant, in *The Tares* the problem is of a different order. Tares grow alongside the wheat until the harvest, and at the harvest the tares are burnt and the wheat stored.

Within that simple framework of a seed parable, the parable of *The Tares* unfolds a series of unexpected actions and responses:[109] the tares are deliberately sown at night by an enemy, as the sower suspects immediately their presence is reported to him, but the wheat and tares are left to grow together until the harvest. The reason given for this procedure is that earlier removal of them would uproot the wheat also.

The parable occurs in the position occupied in Mark 4 by the parable of *The Seed Growing Secretly* (Mk 4:26-29).[110] *The Seed Growing Secretly* is omitted by both Matthew and Luke, but, whereas Matthew omits at this point the parable of *The Lamp* (Mk 4:21-4) as well as *The Seed Growing Secretly*, Luke retains *The Lamp* in its Marcan position, omitting only *The*

[109] Klauck, *Allegorie*, 360.
[110] Hagner, *Matthew*, I 383.

Seed Growing Secretly. The omission of *The Lamp* by Matthew at this point is not particularly significant. Its Marcan function, that of marking the public character of Jesus' proclamation and of warning against inattention, is carried over into the Matthean parabolic discourse by means of the logion in 13:12. The omission of *The Seed Growing Secretly* by both Matthew and Luke is however significant, notably because *The Seed Growing Secretly* could be understood as a view of the Kingdom which bypasses human responsibility. The Kingdom grows while the sower sleeps.

The Tares concerns the dangers which threaten the harvest while the sower sleeps. It resembles the Marcan parable of *The Seed Growing Secretly* in vocabulary,[111] although not in form.[112] It shares with its companion parable, *The Mustard Seed* (Mt 13:31), an introductory Verb with rhetorical associations,[113] and it shares with the two Q parables, *The Mustard Seed* and *The Leaven* (Mt 13:31,33), a parallel opening formula. The replacement of the *The Seed Growing Secretly* by *The Tares* (together with the use of Mk 4:21-25 elsewhere in Matthew) brings *The Tares* into close association with the Interpretation of *The Sower*, and produces a sequence of parabolic material unbroken from 13:18 as far as 13:33. These features of Matthew 13 throw light on Matthew's editorial method of linking Marcan and Q material and need to be explained in terms of that method.

(ii) *The Redaction*

No simple explanation of the replacement of *The Seed Growing Secretly* by *The Tares* is possible. It is an issue complicated by five interrelated factors:

1. *The Tares* and the Interpretation of *The Tares* are linked by seven phrases (five come from Mt 13:24-26; two from Mt 13:29-30).[114] One of

---

[111] Catchpole, *Tares*, gives eight such items of vocabulary: ἄνθρωπος, καθεύδειν, σῖτος, βλαστάνειν, χόρτος, καρπὸς, θερισμὸς, πρῶτον. He comments that two of these are uncommon, or unexpected, and that the total aggregate cannot be written off as mere coincidence.

[112] Four features can be cited: *The Tares* includes conversations between the participants, Mk 4:26-29 does not; *The Tares* has no specific Old Testament quotation at its conclusion, such as those present in Mk 4:26-29 and *The Mustard Seed*; *The Tares* is narrative, 4:26-29 is a similitude; *The Tares* lacks the Comparative Particle found in Mk 4:26-29 and Mk 4:31.

[113] παρέθηκεν in Mt 13:24 and 13:31 is found in the LXX, of Moses setting the commandments before the people (Exodus 19:7; 21:1). In secular use, it is used of the teacher 'taking up points' (Xenophon, *Kurou Paideia*, 1.6.14), of legal submissions ('I put to you' POxy XVII col. i.1.7) and in a range of senses in rhetorical argument: 'present', 'assert', 'argue' (Philodemus, *Volumina Rhetorica*, 6:31; 8:30; 16:11; 20:9; 57:30).

[114] These are in numerical order:

1. vv37 & 24; 2. vv38a & 24; 3. vv38b & 24; 4. vv38c & 25;
5. vv39 & 25; 6. vv39b & 30; 7. vv40 & 30b.

these,[115] and six other words found in *The Tares* but absent from its Interpretation, appear in Mk 4:26-29. Of these latter items the most notable is καθεύδειν, a Verb which assumes considerable importance in Matthew's eschatological discourse. The Interpretation of *The Tares* shares pre-Matthean constructions with the Interpretation of *The Sower*. These considerations taken together suggest that the development of *The Tares* and its Interpretation took place in the context of Marcan influence at a pre-Matthean stage.[116]

2. There are links between *The Tares* and the two Q parables, *The Mustard Seed* and *The Leaven*. These links must be extended to include possible links between *The Tares* and the probable Q context of *The Mustard Seed* and *The Leaven* (see Lk 13:22-30),[117] since the narrative and conversational elements of *The Tares* have parallels in that context.[118]

Of these, Nos. 1-5 relate to Mt 13:24-25; Nos. 6-7 relate to Mt 13:30. These are not the only links between *The Tares* and its Interpretation:
(i) Terminology found in 13:24-25 reappears in 13:26-27;
(ii) προσέρχομαι Mt 13:27; 13:36; see p.294 n.48.
(iii) συλλέγω Mt 13:29, 13:41; see also 13:48.

115 θερισμὸς appears in Mt 13:30 and 13:39; see also Mk 4:29 and Mt 9:37f/Lk 10:2 (3x).

116 See p.312, and Luz, *Matthäus*, 2/1 325.

117 One of the links between the three parables is the opening formula; see p.312 n.113. Others include the Dative of comparison, the reference to the Kingdom of Heaven, and in 13:24 and 13:31 ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ αὐτοῦ. For the links between the parable of *The Tares* and Lk 13:22ff, see Catchpole, *Tares*, 566ff. Lk 13:25 is very possibly a pre-Lucan tradition and the cumulative effect of the items of vocabulary cited by Catchpole is strong; on πόθεν, note that: (i) Lk 13:25 is Diff Mt, and (ii) Mt 13:27 has an exact parallel only in Jn 4:11. Most important of all is the logion Lk 13:28 Par Mt 13:42,50, which may indicate that the Q context of *The Mustard Seed* and *The Leaven* has affected *The Tares* or perhaps the context of the two triplets of the parables *Tares*, *Mustard Seed*, *Leaven / Treasure*, *Pearl*, *Net* (see the vocabulary links between Lk 13:29-30 and *The Net*).

118 A single source for Mt 13:27-29 cannot be adduced from the linguistic evidence. There are some signs of pre-Matthean material, slight signs of redaction, but on the whole it is best to conclude that the linguistic evidence is compatible with a more complex theory of the parable's development than either Q or the Matthean redaction, or both of these together, can provide. The nine relevant tabulations are:
1. οὐχί. See p.274 n.332 (ii).
2. ἐν τῷ σῷ ἀγρῷ
σός Schenk, *Sprache*, 455; Gundry, *Matthew*, 648.
Mt 8x: 2x No Par; 1x Diff Mk; 5x Diff Lk (=1x ἴδιος)
Mk 2x: 1x > ; 1x Diff Mt (Mt σοῦ)
Lk 4x: 1x No Par; 1x Par Mk; 1x Diff Mk; 1x Diff Mt
These uses do not support Schenk's theological and redactional judgments.
ἀγρὸς

Mt 17x: 10x No Par; 2x Par Mk; 1x Diff Mk; 1x Par Lk; 3x Diff Lk (=2x >*)
Mk 9x: 2x Par Mt; 1x > Mt; 5x >*; 1x Text?
Lk 10x: 4x No Par; 3x Par Mk; 1x Par Mt; 1x Diff Mt (=1x >*); 1x Text?

ἐν [τῷ] ἀγρω
Mt 6x: 4x No Par; 1x Diff Mk; 1x Diff Lk or Par Lk
Lk 4x: 1x No Par; 2x Diff Mt (1x Mt ἀγροῦ); 1x Text? or Par Mt
See Marshall, *Luke*, 668.

3. ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτοῖς
Mt 15x: 4x No Par
6x Diff Mk (3x λέγει; 1x ἀπεκρίθη; 1x ἔλεγεν; 1x λέγων)
4x Diff Lk (3x εἶπεν; 1x λέγων)
1x Text?
Mk 6x: 1x > Mt; 5x Diff Mt (Mt 3x ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν; 1x εἶπεν; 1x λέγει)
Lk 7x: 6x No Par; 1x Diff Mk

ὁ δε φησί Mt 13:29 No Par

φησί
Mt 3x: 1x No Par; 1x Diff Mk; 1x Text?
Lk 1x: 1x No Par

The Matthean 1x Diff Mk (Mt 14:8 Diff Mk 6:25) replaces a Marcan construction, θέλω ἵνα, which elsewhere Matthew retains against Par Lk. Schenk's case for the proclamatory, authoritative character of φημί in Matthew is unreliable in the light of the interchange of usage noted above.

4. ἐχθρὸς ἄνθρωπος

(i) The first word of the phrase can be construed as a Noun or as an Adjective. If it were the latter it would be the only definite example of its adjectival use in the New Testament. It is probably nominal, anticipating the role of the devil in Mt 13:39. For this use, see Test Dan 6:2-4; see Foerster, *TDNT*, 2.811-815; 813 n.3; Weder, *Gleichnisse*, 120 n.119.

(ii) ἄνθρωπος is found as follows with appositional Nouns or Adjectives (discounting indefinite and demonstrative Adjectives):

Schenk, *Sprache*, 28; Gundry, *Matthew*, 641.
Mt 12x: 5x No Par; 5x Par Lk; 2x Diff Mk (Mt 27:32,57)
Mk 1x: 1x Diff Mt
Lk 10x: 4x No Par; 3x Par Mk; 1x Par Mt; 1x Diff Mt (=1x >*); 1x Text?

5. μήποτε

Schenk, *Sprache*, 363; Gundry, *Matthew*, 646.
Mt 8x: 5x No Par; 1x Diff Mk; 2x Par Lk
Mk 2x: 2x Diff Mt
Lk 7x: 5x No Par; 2x Par Mt

Of these, only Mk 14:2 Diff Mt is accompanied by the Indicative. All others are accompanied by the Subjunctive or Optative.

6. αὐτῷ λέγουσιν See p.234 n.206.

This has few parallels in the Synoptics. Elsewhere in the Synoptics, when the Verb is used without further verbal qualification and is accompanied by a Dative Pronoun (an extremely widespread usage) the Pronoun always follows the Verb. The exceptions are in the narrative parable in Mt 13:28, in the emphatic address at Mk 2:11 (Diff Mt and Par Lk) and 5:41 (Diff Mt and Diff Lk) and in Lk 6:27 (Diff Mt) and 7:14 (No Par). Mt 13:28 is therefore the only narrative usage. The inversion of a normal synoptic formula without the explanation of an obvious emphasis may point to a distinctive narrative style.

3. Vocabulary integral to the Interpretation of *The Tares*, which is found also in *The Tares*, occurs elsewhere in Matthew 13, as well as in Mark 4, although in the latter with considerably less frequency.[119]

4. The same phrase, ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων, appears in the Interpretation of *The Tares* (Mt 13:42), in *The Net* (Mt 13:50), and in the possible Q context of the twin parables mentioned above (Lk 13:28). Of these, Mt 13:50 concludes a group which exhibits syntactical features shared with *The Tares*, *The Mustard Seed* and *The Leaven* and traceable to pre-Matthean Q material.[120]

5. The ending of *The Tares* and, to a slightly greater extent, the ending of the Interpretation of *The Tares*, use vocabulary found also in the Q version of the teaching of John the Baptist.[121]

---

7. θέλεις + Subjunctive
   Mt 5x: 1x No Par; 3x Par Mk; 1x Diff Mk
   Mk 5x: 3x Par Mt; 1x Diff Mt (Mt τί θέλετε;); 1x Text?
   Lk 3x: 1x No Par; 2x Par Mk

8. ἅμα
   This is found as an independent Preposition only twice in the New Testament: at Mt 13:29 with the Dative and at Mt 20:1 with an Adverb (see Acts 28:23). The former use is frequent in the LXX, but not the latter (see Homer, *Iliad*, 9.682).

9. ἐκριζώσητε
   This Verb is found only 4 times in the New Testament: in Mt 13:29, Mt 15:13 (as part of anti-Pharisaic unit), Lk 17:6 (on which see Telford, *Barren Temple*, 113ff) and Jude 12. The word has associations of violence (Wis 4:4; *Cor Fab Aesop*, 239 II.6,71), of judgment (Dan 4:11), and of apocalyptic judgment (Dan 7:8, Theodotion). There is no evidence of an earlier stage of *The Tares* which lacked this nuance.

Summary:
Evidence of Q: Nos. 1,2;
Evidence of pre-Matthean narrative: Nos. 6,8(?),9(?);
Evidence of traditional usage: Nos. 3,4(?),5(?),7.

[119] The Adjective καλός is frequent in the Matthean chapter of parables over against the other synoptic parallels:
Mt 13:8,23,24,27,37,38,45,48; Mk 4:8,20; Lk 8:15.
The use of the Noun σπέρμα: in ch. 13 Mt 5x No Par; 1x Par Mk.
Mt 13:24,27,32(Par Mk),37,38; Mk 4:31 (Par Mt).

[120] Compare the syntax of the following passages:
Mt 13:31/Lk 13:19(Diff Mk); Mt 13:33/Lk 13:21; Mt 13:44; also Mt 24:46/Lk 12:43.
Compare also the use of a Noun in the Dative of Comparison with an attributive Participle: Mt 13:24,44,45,47; Mt 11:16/Lk 7:32 (although with a Definite Article); and Lk 6:48,49 both Diff Mt. For the use of attributive Participles in parabolic contexts without the Dative, see Lk 13:6; 14:31 and 17:7.

[121] These elements are:
1. συνάγω εἰς τὴν ἀποθήκην
   Mt 13:30c; Mt 3:12/Lk 3:17

To these five factors should be added the two features already noted above, that *The Tares* is associated by position in the Matthean material with the Interpretation of *The Sower* and that *The Tares* and the Interpretation of *The Tares* are separated by several parables and a narrative interlude.

It is extremely difficult to explain such a complex pattern of relationships by means of the presently available source theories about Mark and Q and the presently available redaction theories about Matthew's handling of those sources. Some of them can be explained as Catchpole[122] suggests: we can posit a brief, original parable in which there was an overlap between the teaching of Jesus with that of John the Baptist;[123] and we can posit the imposition of various influences, Q influences, influences from 13:36,43 and from Matthew's own style,[124] upon the original parable at the point of the Matthean redactional work. This redactional work, argues Catchpole, involved the displacement of Mk 4:26, 29 by *The Tares*; so the intrusion of Marcan elements into the parable of *The Tares* at the time of the redactional work can also be explained by the same theory. But this is only to deal with *some* of the complex interrelationships within the relevant material. Catchpole's theory provides no explanation of the pre-Matthean features of the two Interpretations, Mt 13:18-23 and 13:36-43. It does not explain the distance within Mt 13 between *The Tares* and its Interpretation. Moreover it is based on unreliable statistical methods for separating Matthean tradition from Matthean redactional activity.[125] Even scholars who, in order to

---

as against συλλέγω in Mt 13:28,29,30,40,41,48.

2. σῖτος

Mt 13:25,29,30; Mt 3:12/Lk 3:17; Lk 12:18.

3. κατακαίω

Mt 3:12; 13:30,40; Mt 3:12/Lk 3:17;

with συνάγω in Mt 13:30 and Mt 3:12/Lk 3:17 (i.e. in Q and in *The Tares*, but not in the Interpretation of *The Tares*).

These three occur at the conclusion of the parable and its Interpretation. Mk 4:26-29, unlike *The Tares*, ends with an Old Testament quotation; this quotation concerns judgment, but has few vocabulary links with the conclusion of *The Tares*. The conclusion of *The Tares* is closer in vocabulary to the Q version of John the Baptist's teaching. The overriding of Marcan influence by Q material at this point is not explained by Catchpole, *Tares*, 558, 570, and remains a flaw in his case for the authenticity of a shorter version of *The Tares*.

122 Catchpole, *Tares*, 569.

123 Catchpole, *Tares*, 569.

124 βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, τότε, δήσατε αὐτὰ εἰς δέσμας, ὡμοιώθη.

125 This note concerns first the phrases claimed by Catchpole as redactional, and second the possibility of separating tradition and redaction in the parable of *The Tares*.

(i) The phrases claimed by Catchpole as redactional.

1. On βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν: see p.199 n.88.

(a) The fact that Matthew does not turn all uses of βασιλεία into the phrase βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν raises two issues: First, do the variants on this phrase point to sources (Mt 6:10/Lk 11:2; Mt 6:33/Lk 12:31; Mt 8:12 Diff Lk; Mt 13:19, 16:28 Diff Mk and Diff Lk; Mt 13:38,41,43; note the range of variants in Mt 19:23-28; Mt 20:21 Diff Mt; Mt 21:31,43; Mt 24:13; Mt 26:29)? Second, if they do, and that is at least a viable thesis, since the variants have proved difficult to fit into a single editorial pattern, why should not the unevenness of the βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν usages also point to Matthean sources (e.g in 13:44,45,47 and 25:1 but not in 25:14 and 31)?

(b) To what extent are the theories of a Jewish background for βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, and for the Gospel as a whole, a reason for choosing to call this phrase redactional? If on the other hand, and this again is a viable hypothesis, the phrase represents a meeting-point of Jewish and Gentile interests, need it have been the Matthean editor who created it? Might it not have been the presupposition of Matthew's work rather than its result?

(c) The rich background to βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν (e.g. Mt 22:2) suggests that it has gained through various traditions a wider range of reference than βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ. Was the Matthean editor alone responsible for that process?

2. On τότε, see p.220 n.165, p.232 n.205 (iv). Here τότε balances ὅτε.

See Mt 21:1 Diff Mk and Diff Lk; and Mt 13:26 and Jn 12:16. When τότε is unusually frequent and ὅτε not infrequent, why are the two used together only twice?

ὅτε Schenk, *Sprache*, 447; Gundry, *Matthew*, 61.

Mt 12x: 5x No Par; 3x Par Mk; 4x > Mk

Mk 12x: 3x Par Mt; 6x > ; 2x >*; 1x Diff Mt (Genitive Absolute)

Lk 11x: 8x No Par; 1x Diff Mk (Mk Genitive Absolute);
1x Diff Mt (=1x Mt >*); 1x No Par or Diff Mk

3. On δήσατε αὐτὰ εἰς δέσμας.

Catchpole suggests that Mt 22:12 is evidence that this phrase is redactional. But neither the 'binding' nor the 'servant/harvesters' terminology can be assigned to specific places in the tradition and redaction of either *The Tares* or *The Feast.*

δέω Schenk, *Sprache*, 175; Gundry, *Matthew*, 642.

Mt 10x: 6x No Par; 4x Par Mk

Mk 8x: 4x Par Mt; 3x > ; 1x Diff Mt (Mk 15:7 Diff Mt 27:16 δέσμιον)

Lk 2x: 1x No Par; 1x Par Mk

4. On ὡμοιώθη, see p.177 n.4.

(ii) The possibility of separating traditional and redactional elements in *The Tares.*

1. See pp.311-316.

2. ἐπέσπειρεν. The use of ἐπι-compounds is dubious evidence for redactional activity. Schenk suggests an 'oppositional' element for ἐπέσπειρεν in 13:25, but then quotes Pindar's 'additional' usage as relevant (see also Jülicher, *Gleichnisreden*, II 547). The 'oppositional' element is overworked by Schenk in his discussions of the forthcoming items. The findings below also include factors which Schenk omits and which add further question marks to his method. Generalizations, such as the attribution of ἐπι-compounds to Matthean editorship, are also seen to be unreliable (on ἐπιλαμβάνομαι, see below).

ἐπιβάλλω Schenk, *Sprache*, 84.

Mt 2x: 1x Par Mk; 1x Diff Mk

Mk 4x: 1x Par Mt; 1x > ; 2x Diff Mt (Intransitive uses)
Lk 5x: 3x No Par; 1x Diff Mk; 1x Par Mt

ἐπιγινώσκω Schenk, *Sprache*, 136; Gundry, *Matthew*, 644; p.210 n.131.
Mt 6x: 2x No Par; 1x Par Mk; 1x Diff Mk; 2x Diff Lk
Mk 4x: 1x Par Mt; 1x Diff Mt (γνούς); 2x >
Lk 7x: 6x No Par; 1x Par Mk
For a discussion of Schenk on this item, see p.210 n.131.

ἐπιδείκνυμι Schenk, *Sprache*, 168; Gundry, *Matthew*, 644.
Mt 3x: 3x Diff Mk
Lk 1x: 1x No Par

ἐπερωτάω Schenk, *Sprache*, 261.
Mt 8x: 5x Par Mk; 3x Diff Mk
Mk 25x: 5x Par Mt; 8x > ; 1x > Mt; 11x Diff Mt
Lk 17x: 7x No Par; 6x Par Mk; 3x Diff Mk; 1x Text?

ἐπιζητέω Schenk, *Sprache*, 270; Gundry, *Matthew*, 644.
Mt 3x: 1x Par Lk; 1x Diff Lk; 1x Diff Mk (2x Diff ζητέω)
Lk 2x: 1x No Par; 1x Par Mt

ἐπιθυμέω Schenk, *Sprache*, 140; Gundry, *Matthew*, 645.
Mt 2x: 1x No Par; 1x Diff Lk
Lk 4x: 4x No Par

ἐπικαθίζω Schenk, *Sprache*, 313; Gundry, *Matthew*, 644.
Mt 1x: 1x Diff Mk

ἐπικαλέω Schenk, *Sprache,* 316; Gundry, *Matthew*, 645.
Mt 1x: 1x No Par

ἐπιλαμβάνομαι
Mt 1x: 1x No Par. Mk 1x: 1x >
Lk 5x: 3x No Par; 2x Diff Mk (see Jeremias, *Sprache*, 236)

ἐπιλανθάνομαι Schenk, *Sprache*, 245.
Mt 1x: 1x Par Mk
Mk 1x: 1x Par Mt
Lk 1x: 1x Diff Mt or No Par

ἐπισκέπτομαι
Mt 2x: 2x No Par
Lk 3x: 3x No Par

3. ἀνὰ μέσον
Mt 3x: 3x No Par (2x with δηνάριον in Mt 20:9f)
Mk 1x: 1x > Mt (Mk 7:31 ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ὁρίων)
Lk 3x: 1x No Par; 2x Diff Mk

4. ἀφίημι (allow) + Infinitive. See p.333 n.204.
Mt 5x: 3x No Par (1x + Infinitive); 1x Par Mk (+ Infinitive); 2x Par Lk (1x + Infinitive)
Mk 5x: 1x Par Mt; 3x > ; 1x > Mt
Lk 6x: 2x Par Mk; 2x Par Mt; 2x Diff Mt (Mt 1x ἐάω)

5. συναυξάνεσθαι σὺν-compounds are not distinctively Matthean redaction.

6. ἀμφότερα
Mt 3x: 1x No Par; 1x Diff Mk; 1x Par Lk
Lk 5x: 4x No Par; 1x Par Mk. The most important use here is Mt 9:17. Although it is unlikely that Mt 9:17 and Mt 13:30 share a common theological interest, there is the possibility of a stylistic link between them.

7. ἕως = temporal 'until'+ Noun (excluding ἀπὸ...ἕως).

explain the changes involved in moving from sources to the final text have given a greater role to oral tradition than Catchpole does, fail to describe and explain the full range of these interrelationships.

The solution offered here is that the redactor used the parable of *The Tares* in a similar form to that which he inherited from tradition, although the pre-Matthean tradition was longer and more complex than is often assumed, and that the redactor's main contribution to the history of *The Tares* was the fresh interpretation which he gave to that parable when he made it part of his commentary on Christian responsibility in Matthew 13.

(iii) *The Tradition*

A hypothetical history of the parable's tradition would read as follows:

1. If *The Tares* can be traced to the historical Jesus, it defies reconstruction at that stage. There is insufficient clarity about Stage 2 for a prior stage to be envisaged in any detail, except that *The Mustard Seed* and another 'growth'[126] parable akin to what is suggested for Stage 2, could have been associated at a very early stage.

2. The growth parable existed in association with the Q material as the first of a triplet of parables including *The Mustard Seed* and *The Leaven*,

---

Mt 11:13 Diff Lk
Mt 13:30 No Par
Mt 26:29 Par Mk (Mk 14:25; a similar expression in Luke)
Mt 27:8 No Par = to the present day (= and is the case today)
Mt 27:45 Par Mk (Mk 15:33) and Lk (Lk 23:44)
Mt 27:64 No Par 'until the third day'
Mt 28:20 No Par 'until the end of the age'
Lk 1:80 No Par 'until the day when'

8. ἐρῶ See p.255 n.268.

9. πρῶτον Schenk, *Sprache*, 263; Gundry, *Matthew*, 647.
Mt 8x: 2x No Par; 2x Par Mk; 2x Par Lk; 2x Diff Lk (>*)
Mk 7x: 2x Par Mt; 2x > ; 1x >*; 1x Diff Mt; 1x Text?
Lk 10x: 6x No Par; 2x Par Mk; 1x Diff Mk; 1x Diff Mt (>*)
Immediately after an Imperative:
Mt 5x: 1x No Par; 2x Par Lk; 2x Diff Lk
Mk 1x: 1x >
Lk 2x: 2x Par Mt
Immediately before an Imperative:
Mt 1x: 1x No Par
Lk 2x: 1x No Par; 1x Diff Mt (>*)

10. κατακαῦσαι. The evidence for a Matthean predilection for κατα-compounds is poor.
Summary: The above findings are open to an interpretation of the text of *The Tares* which finds there various levels of tradition rather than a clearly defined relationship of source and redaction.

126 Weder, *Gleichnisse*, 120 n.118.

possibly involving material parallel to Q John the Baptist logia. At this stage the purpose of the growth parable would have been like that of Lk 13:6-9 (and its accompanying healing, 13:10-17): to qualify the message of 'the axe is laid to the tree' with 'there is still time for repentance and deliverance'. If it was a 'seed parable' (replaced by Lk 13:6-9 with *The Fig Tree*), it would have emphasized the time lapse between sowing and harvest, perhaps with the suggestion of coexistence of wheat and weeds until the harvest.

3. *The Tares* parable proper would then have emerged, as a result of the introduction of *The Mustard Seed* and its accompanying seed parable into the context of *The Sower* and its Interpretation. Narrative and conversational elements from the Q context were used to build out the narrative section, and interpretative features were incorporated in the parable in the manner typical of the 'Vision and Interpretation' style.[127] The context was that of the missionaries responsible for the development of *The Sower* and its Interpretation.

4. The use of *The Tares* within the Marcan tradition made clear the dangers inherent in Mk 4:26-29, notably in the phrase αὐτομάτη ἡ γῆ καρποφορει (Mk 4:28). Laxity or irresponsibility, characterized as 'sleep'[128] (Mt 13:25; Mk 4:27), a feature of *The Tares* not highlighted in its Interpretation, could allow good growth to be ruined by evil activities.

5. The grouping of *The Tares* with other Q parables, itself part of a triplet, and alongside a further triplet (*Treasure*, *Pearl*, *Net*), gave fresh significance to the parable's emphasis on the separation of good and evil at the Last Judgment. It began to serve as a warning not of a Coming Judgment only (as in the form influenced by the John the Baptist tradition), but against too strict a discipline within the church in advance of the Final Judgment.[129]

6. At the time of final redaction the parable of *The Tares* was introduced immediately after the Interpretation of *The Sower* because of the displacement of Mk 4:21-25 (see the headline use of 4:21 in the Sermon on the Mount at 5:15) and because of the incorporation of Mk 4:26-29 into the material of *The Tares*. The parabolic material associated with *The Tares* was introduced next, in its traditional order: *Tares*, *Mustard Seed*, *Leaven*, *Tares Interpretation*, *Treasure*, *Pearl*, *Net*. The order was kept despite the narrative

---

127 Crossan, *Jesus*, 280.

128 See the treatment of Mt 25:1-13 on p.443.

129 Barth, *Kirchenzucht*, 158; Weder, *Gleichnisse*, 127; Davies, *Matthew*, II 408 n.6; Catchpole, *Tares*, 561, and 560 for the caveat concerning Mt 13:47-50; Klein, *Frömmigkeit*, 469, where the difference between leaving judgment until the End and making clear judgments now (18:15-18) is exposed as a significant ecclesiological differential within the Matthean Sondergut.

requirements of the Marcan outline. The effect of this redaction was to make the whole complex of material into a comment on the need for continuing Christian responsibility.

7. GThom 57 in its present textual form represents a post-Matthean phase. It could contain earlier traditions, but the Matthean influence there is too great to allow a reliable identification of them.[130]

(iv) *The History of the Parables*

The Tares was probably a parable created at the same time as its Interpretation, and reflecting that Interpretation in its earliest narrative form. Its subsequent history produced a parable capable of refracting the interests of associated material,[131] a development not uncommon in Hellenistic literature.[132] This 'extended' feature is a Matthean characteristic.

(v) *The History of Redaction*

The Tares illustrates the difficulty of distinguishing tradition from redaction. In all probability the two issues of the order of the Matthean parables and the displacement of *The Seed Growing Secretly* need to be solved at the level of tradition, but there is no doubt that the writer of Matthew appreciated the message of judgment embodied in *The Tares* against the 'quietism' of Mk 4:26-29. All the same, the adoption of the traditional form of *The Tares* by the redactor did not prevent him from giving that parable a new significance within the contrast between 'privilege' and 'possible failure' which the earlier verses of Matthew 13 presented. The parable gives that contrast eschatological contours, placing Christian responsibility in the tension between the past, the present and the future.

In sum, if the argument of this section is sound, *The Tares* emerged when Q material was introduced into the context of Marcan material. It became

---

[130] There is a consensus that the unexplained Pronouns in GThom 57 (91.1.2f) are a feature unique to the Thomas version: Schrage, *Thomas-Evangeliums*, 124; Fieger, *Thomas*, 170. Several scholars trace these and other features to an abbreviation of Matthew's text. This is possible, but it is not clear that the text of Thomas can be regarded with any completeness as a version of Matthew. Nor do those features which lack adequate explanation suggest a pre-Matthean stage. The difficulties are illustrated by the triple use of ϱωϡ: this reflects the violence associated with ἐκριζόω without that particular Coptic root being used elsewhere as a translation of ἐκριζόω. The choice of ϱωϡ is noteworthy, all the more so because of the availability of other possible Coptic alternatives.

[131] This is particularly true of the 'sleep' theme in 13:25, the addition of judgment phrases in 13:30, and the repetition of the key elements such as 'good seed' and 'ground' across the series of six parables.

[132] Drögmüller, *Gleichnisse*, 16ff, 240ff.

eventually a parable of the separation of good and evil at the Last Judgment, used by the final editor as a comment on one of the major concerns of the Gospel, that of Christian responsibility. It represents a point of convergence between the Marcan and the Q traditions and raises, more obviously than any previously discussed parable, a question to which the study of the Matthean parables has to address itself. If the traditions within the parable can best be explained in terms of a history of tradition in which both Marcan and Q contexts played a part, how did this happen? Chapter Three suggested a scenario in which this could have taken place. First, there needs to be a context in which the Marcan and the Q parabolic material began to circulate together. Second, *The Tares* opens up areas of responsibility before the Last Days, and, as we saw in the case of *The Sheep and the Goats*, they are areas of unexpected range: as appears from the Interpretation of *The Tares*. The field is the world! Third, the process of rehearsing traditions developed a patience with those who sponsored different traditions. It was seen to be necessary and right that judgment should be left to God at the Last Day.

D. *The Mustard Seed* Mt 13:31-32 and pars

(i) *The Context*

The Mustard Seed and *The Leaven* are of similar constructions and are found together in Matthew and in Luke (Mt 13:31-33/Lk 13:18-21).[133] In Mark *The Mustard Seed* appears with *The Seed Growing Secretly*, and they are both of similar construction in Mark; the former is found in Matthew, but not, as has already been noted, the latter.[134] The Lucan version of *The Mustard Seed* follows up Jesus' offer of grace to his opponents and his promise of deliverance and blessing to the oppressed.[135] The Marcan version gives an assurance to the few that despite the blindness of the many, and despite all appearances to the contrary, the future of the few will be great.[136] The Matthean version, occupying the same relative position within Mt 13 as the parable does in Mt 4,[137] brings to Mt 13 a missionary or universal emphasis, and prepares the way, with *The Leaven*, for further consideration of that emphasis.

---

133 Schulz, *Q*, 298-307; Laufen, *Doppelüberlieferungen*, 174-197; Crossan, *Jesus*, 276-279; Schramm, *Markus-Stoff*; Klauck, *Allegorie*, 210ff.

134 The parables of *The Mustard Seed* and *The Leaven* follow the pericope of *The Fig Tree* (Lk 13:6-9), *The Healing of the Woman* (Lk 13:10-17) and the eschatological warnings of Lk 13:22-33. See Telford, *Barren Temple*, 224-339; Johnson, *Possessions*, 103-115.

135 Weder, *Gleichnisse*, 134ff.

136 Laufen, *ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ*, 105-140.

137 Kingsbury, *Parables*, 77ff.

(ii) *The Redaction*

Theories concerning the redaction of *The Mustard Seed* need to be judged by their suitability for *The Leaven* also. A theory which explains only the extended form of *The Mustard Seed* in Matthew but not Matthew's retention of the short form of *The Leaven* cannot be regarded as wholly satisfactory.[138] The theory that Matthean redactional work turns *The Mustard Seed* into a reflection on salvation-history is probably to be rejected on that ground alone. Certainly that approach does not account for the retention of the short form of *The Leaven.*[139] If, on the other hand, the Matthean parable of *The Mustard Seed* is seen as a combining of traditional language and syntax from both Mark and Q,[140] then Matthew's acceptance of the short version of *The Leaven* could be understood as part of a consistent policy, that of using available traditions in their traditional form.

There are three characteristics of the Matthean *Mustard Seed* which can be evaluated redactionally. First, the word μικρότερον has strong resonances;[141] this includes the Kingdom's values and their Christological basis. Second, the mixed Parable–Similitude form of the Matthean parable suggests elements of contrast and growth in relation to the Kingdom.[142] Third, the 'tree'[143] metaphor could be regarded as an emblematic metaphor, capable of attracting to the parable a number of associated pictures[144] and

---

[138] For a comment on Kingsbury, *Parables*, 80ff, see ch.1 pp.46-47.

[139] See pp.329-330.

[140] The following are examples of traditional usage:

1) ὁμοία p.177 n.4; p.202;
2) ὃν λαβὼν p.275 n.332 (v);
3) ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ p.313 n.118 (2);
4) μὲν..δὲ p.253 n.262;
5) ὅταν p.230 n.205.

[141] See p.247 n.243. For Matthew's use of evocative models in a personalized form, see Thysman, *Communauté*. For the Christological basis, pace Neyrey, *Isaiah*, see Mt 12:18-21. Against that background μικρότερον has important resonances: the danger inherent in social and political estimates of one's neighbours and of the church's role and message.

[142] Contrast and growth may have ecclesiological implications, as Kingsbury, Frankemölle and Kretzer suggest. But in Mt 13 contrast and growth relate to the contrast of modest beginnings/amazing results and to that of moral failure/success.

[143] Feldman, *Parables*, 100ff.

[144] Laufen, *ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ*, 113, distinguishes between the Daniel 4:21 (Theodotion) reference in Q and Ezek 17:23 in Mark. On Ps 104(103):12, see Klauck, *Allegorie*, 212.

mythical[145] references, by means of which the missionary or universal factor[146] in the parable gained poetic and emotional depth.[147]

(iii) *The Tradition*

Few parables have a more complex tradition than *The Mustard Seed.*[148] Three factors contribute to this complexity. First, as has been noted above, *The Mustard Seed* is paired with *The Leaven* in Matthew and Luke, and with *The Seed Growing Secretly* in Mark. These resemblances in construction have been carefully analysed, and the attempts to disentangle tradition from redaction have led to opposing conclusions: some conclude that Matthew and Luke represent a tradition of paired parables going back to Jesus;[149] others conclude that the Marcan tradition represents an independent single parable to which different levels of redaction have been added.[150] Some discussions of the history of *The Mustard Seed* are deployed on the basis of a strictly literary comparison of the synoptic texts.[151] Others argue on the basis of oral tradition that different parabolic groupings can be assumed as a background to the synoptic texts.[152]

Second, the three characteristics of the Matthean version of *The Mustard Seed*, the mixed Parable–Similitude form, the reference to the size of the mustard seed, and the resonances of the 'tree' metaphor, can each be presented as part of a long history.[153] The mixed Parable–Similitude form goes back to the narrative parable of the Q tradition[154] and the proverb style of the Marcan parable;[155] but before and after those two there were probably

---

145 Crossan, *Jesus*, 277; Laufen, *BAΣIΛEIA*, 113 n.50.

146 See Jeremias, *Parables*, 147 n.69. The 'universal' factor in Matthew has ecclesiological, eschatological and Christological facets.

147 Mussner, *Senfkorn*, 128-130; Funk, *Looking-glass Tree*, 3-9.

148 Laufen, *BAΣIΛEIA*, 137-139.

149 Dupont, *Sénevé*, 331-345; Flusser, *Gleichnisse*, 198-204.

150 Klauck, *Allegorie*, 210-211; Weder, *Gleichnisse*, 128-134, especially 130 n.156; Hunziger, *TDNT*, 7 287-291.

151 e.g. Klauck, *Allegorie*, 210, appears to regard redactional method as involving the replacement of one item of vocabulary by another. If this is questioned, his argument for the priority of the Marcan version is weakened.

152 McArthur, *Mustard Seed*, 209 n.201: 'There may not have been a single form behind Mk, Q and Thomas but several forms.' For the idea of parabolic groupings behind Matthew's form, see Cope, *Matthew*, 26.

153 Matthew provides a fresh structure in which these three features can be heard afresh.

154 Is there assimilation of *The Mustard Seed* to *The Leaven* at this point? See Laufen, *BAΣIΛEIA*, 110, on Schweizer's comment that no one would sow one mustard seed.

155 Characteristic of the Marcan version is the use of the Present tense for the growth of the seed, a corresponding reference to the proverbial smallness of the seed, alongside the narrative reference to sowing. Hooker, *Mark*, 137,

other stages.[156] The origins of the Q and Marcan forms might be a pair of metaphors exposing the relationship of the everyday and the divine,[157] and later stages a parable of growth, and/or contrast.[158] An early relationship between the Q and the Marcan traditions is likely.[159] That is suggested by the association of both metaphorical traditions with the Kingdom,[160] within a similar structure,[161] and with some common Greek vocabulary.

The reference to the proverbial size of the mustard seed, which is characteristic of the Marcan and Matthean traditions, may be a relatively later addition to the parable.[162] In Mark it is accompanied by three curious grammatical features,[163] which could indicate development within the tradition. In part the proverbial reference is reinforced in Mark by associated elements;[164] in part it serves to emphasize contrast and/or growth. In the Gospel of Thomas the size of the seed may well serve a distinctive theological purpose.[165] But there can be little doubt that a mustard seed, whether or not it was originally associated with leaven, was chosen initially

---

understands these features as indications that as the mustard bush springs from the almost invisible seed so the Kingdom will follow from the ministry of Jesus; the Kingdom of God is displayed in the life of Jesus; but no one knows that it is there unless he or she is let into the secret.

156 See pp.110-115.

157 Either as culinary ingredients, effective in hardly noticeable quantities, or (perhaps with ζιζάνια) as infamous undesirables: Funk, *Leaven*, 162-167; Crossan, *Jesus*, 276-281.

158 Laufen, *ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ*, 115 n.61. Growth and contrast were inevitable elements in the post-Easter use of the parable: Kuss, *Sinngehalt*, 78-84; for rabbinic evidence of 'growth' as part of tree parables, see Cave, *Parables*, 374-387.

159 The associations of the *The Mustard Seed* with the Kingdom are present in both the Q and Marcan traditions.

160 Both the Marcan and (probably) the Q traditions end with an Old Testament reference.

161 The use of γίνομαι in Mt 13:32, Mk 4:32 and Lk 13:19 has been the subject of a great deal of discussion: Laufen, *ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ*, 107, declines to attribute to Luke in 13:19 (Diff Mt and Mk) a 'semitizing' construction such as γίνομαι εἰς. The argument is very speculative: the description 'semitizing' is in this context, as so often, ambiguous; in the LXX γίνομαι and γίνομαι εἰς can be interchangeable; Luke might have wished to tone down the imagery by using a phrase suggesting 'become like' rather than 'become'. The grammar could hardly in this case be evidence of the authentic version of the parable.

162 Laufen, *ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ*, 111 n.40, for the secondary sources on this issue.

163 The presence of the proverbial reference to the smallness of the mustard seed in Mark involves three uneven features of grammar. It is unlikely in the light of these features that the proverbial reference to the smallness of the seed belonged originally in Mark with the narrative element ὅταν σπαρῇ.

164 e.g. ἀναβαίνει, γίνεται, ποιεῖ.

165 Sheppard, *Thomas*, 177.

because of its size, so that the specific reference in Mark and Matthew to its proverbial smallness is more a matter of emphasis than a change of meaning.[166]

The resonances of the 'tree' metaphor can be illustrated in a number of ways. The Q version, using δένδρον, might be a humorous or ironical picture, extravagantly claiming that this wild weed might produce a strangely threatening progeny.[167] The Q and the Marcan versions both contain Old Testament allusions to the tree,[168] and these provide various nuances at the climax of the parable.[169] These differing allusions[170] have often been regarded as secondary but they need not necessarily be deemed so simply because they arise from the Old Testament.[171]

Third, there is the issue of the introduction to *The Mustard Seed.* Is it possible to trace behind the Q and Marcan traditions a Semitic, double question at the opening of the parable? The arguments are not conclusive;[172] and in any case we cannot be sure of the significance of such an opening double question. It might reveal how the parable originally began or it might suggest how such a common opening came to be shared by subsequent synoptic traditions.[173]

---

166 Marshall, *Luke*, 560.

167 McArthur, *Mustard Seed*, 198ff; Funk, *Looking-glass Tree*, 3ff.

168 See p.323 n.144.

169 Laufen, *BAΣIΛEIA*, 112, treats the conclusions of Mark and Q as expressing substantially the same idea. The Old Testament allusions may have operated differently at both earlier and later stages.

170 Mark and Q agree in the use of κατασκηνοῦν, although the meaning of this is not entirely certain (Klauck, *Allegorie*, 216; Hooker, *Mark*, 136). They differ in Mark's reference to ὑπὸ τὴν σκιὰν αὐτοῦ (see Lam 4:20 for the metaphor used of God's protection) and the reference in Q to ἐν τοῖς κλάδοις αὐτοῦ. The origin of Matthew's ἐλθεῖν is difficult to determine; the order of words following ὥστε does not seem to be redactional.

171 Klauck, *Allegorie*, 216, finds an acceptable centre for the tradition in Ezek 17:23, but in view of the range of possibilities surveyed by scholars there can be no certainty. For the likelihood that the Gospel of Thomas's omission of an Old Testament quotation is editorial, see Briscoe, *Thomas*, 67ff.

172 See p.177 n.4.

173 That Jesus of Nazareth used double questions to introduce parables is by no means certain. The frequency of double introductions to rabbinic parables and the hypothesis of an LXX citation in Mk 4:30 (Bartsch, *Zitierung*, 126-128) cannot be taken as decisive evidence either for or against. Luke himself was not responsible for the double question (Jeremias, *Sprache*, 230). Mark could have been; he favoured dualities (Neirynck, *Duality*, 54ff); but he might have reformulated his own first question in the light of the verb in Q (Lambrecht, *Mk.IV*, 294ff). Again the query regarding a link between Mark and Q is raised.

Not only is the history of the parable's tradition long and complex, its relationship to early Christian eschatology has also been fiercely debated.[174] The parable speaks of contrast and growth. Are these to be related to an apocalyptic vision, or to a Kingdom which has a beginning, a development and a climax?[175] Do the intermediate stages of its history of tradition reflect events in the life of the Early Church?[176] Is Q a confident picture of the Gentiles being welcomed into a legally minded Christian community? Or is this stretching the parable beyond breaking point?[177] Is there behind Mark a pre-Marcan collection of parables, including *The Mustard Seed,* drawn together to emphasize Christian confidence in what Jesus Christ began?[178] Did Mark incorporate this into a new framework of thought?[179] And was that framework apocalyptic?

It has been suggested above that the parable need not originally have had a specific connection with the Kingdom. It has also been suggested that the stages in the parable's history are not so clearly defined as redactional analysis has suggested. No doubt the proverbial reference to the smallness of the mustard seed passed through stages of missionary reflection, apocalyptic interpretation and gnostic reinterpretation. No doubt the 'tree' metaphor too passed through various stages of use, in relation to apocalyptic hopes, warnings to the unrepentant, and to the church's mission. It may be right to associate some of these interpretative stages with stages in the history of the tradition mentioned earlier. But the history of *The Mustard Seed* is such that such theories need to be treated with caution.

(iv) *The History of the Parables*

The mysteries of this parable's history cannot be solved by presently available redactional methods of analysis. If it could be established that oral groupings of parables preceded and followed the writing of Mark, then fresh approaches would be possible. For example, if a pre-Matthean stage can be assumed at which *The Tares*, *The Mustard Seed* and *The Leaven*, and later *The Pearl*, *The Treasure* and *The Net* were gathered together, and these could both be regarded as, in some sense, levels of the Q tradition, then fresh layers in the history of *The Mustard Seed* could be exposed. The motivation for such a large collection might be investigated. Such a collection might well, for example, as was suggested in the case of *The Tares*, have been focused on issues of Christian responsibility in the light of a future

174 Laufen, *BAΣIΛEIA*, 120ff.
175 Dahl, *Gleichnis*, Sp. 1614-1619, *Parables*, 132-166.
176 Schultze, *Senfkorn*, 362ff.
177 Laufen, *BAΣIΛEIA*, 127f.
178 Weder, *Gleichnisse*, 134ff.
179 Weder, *Gleichnisse*, 135 n.181.

judgment. In that case the range of reference of each parable would not be restricted by such a grouping. On the contrary, such groupings would enlarge the range of each. That would be true also of the following stage, the writing of Matthew 13. Far from giving *The Mustard Seed* a more precise sense, as some redaction critics suggest, the writing of Matthew 13 could have widened its possible range of reference still further.

(v) *The History of Redaction*

The study of this parable's history has illustrated how interesting it can be to recognize various parabolic levels of reference. It has also shown the value of distinguishing clearly between, on the one hand, reading off redactional theology from a text and, on the other, discussing possible theological motivations behind a text. Futhermore *The Mustard Seed* shows how metaphors, particularly emblematic metaphors, operate very differently within those various levels of reference. The early uses, perhaps even authentic ways in which Jesus of Nazareth used them, may have differed substantially from the later uses belonging to the time of the Early Church.

E. *The Leaven* Mt 13:32/Lk13:20-21

(i) *The Context*

This is the last of the sequence of parables in 13:18-33. It is accompanied by *The Mustard Seed* in Matthew and Luke, but not in Mark and GThom, and has rhythmic and syntactical similarities with the Q form of *The Mustard Seed*,[180] only some of which are shared with other parables in Mt 13.[181] These features, together with the brevity of *The Leaven*, are most easily understood as evidence of earlier traditions and groupings of parables, in which the particular relationship of *The Leaven* and *The Mustard Seed* was retained. Both *The Leaven* and *The Mustard Seed* concern 'contrast and/or growth', and this common feature is of some relevance to the Lucan context in which they both appear and to the possible Q context to be inferred for them.[182] This may also be true in part for Matthew 13. However, in Matthew 13 a further factor has to be considered. *The Leaven* ends a sequence

[180] These two areas of similarity are shared by *The Mustard Seed* and *The Leaven* and are only partly shared with them by other Marcan and Matthean parables in Mark 4 and Matthew 13. They are the syntactical and the rhythmic areas. Evidence has been provided for the former. With regard to the latter, syllable counts provide evidence of rhythmic characteristics. They support the syntactical findings that *The Mustard Seed* and *The Leaven* share similarities distinctive within Mk 4 and Mt 13.

[181] See p.275 n.332 (v).

[182] Weder, *Gleichnisse*, 136.

of parables, and the metaphor of 'leaven' becomes a point of focus within Matthew 13, coming as it does immediately before Matthew's second comment on the nature of parables and the nature of their audiences.[183]

(ii) *The Redaction*

Both Matthew and Luke used the tradition as they received it. The introduction to the parable is the only area where the two Gospels disagree.[184] This retention of the tradition lacks any adequate explanation on the usual literary-critical assumptions. Nor does the content of the parable provide a reason for Matthew's retention of the tradition. First, why should Matthew have refused to retain the parable of *The Seed Growing Secretly* in its Marcan or Q form, and yet have kept word for word the Q tradition of the 'Leaven acting secretly'? Second, to judge by its contents, is not *The Leaven* out of place in an unbroken sequence of 'seed' parables?[185] Why has Matthew kept the tradition unchanged and why has he given it that place? Is not the best explanation for the retention here of *The Leaven* that the parable is included because of its position in the loose compilatory sequence of parabolic material which Matthew inherited, and that, given such a position within the parabolic material, and given the place which Matthew chose for this parable in relation to the Marcan outline, the metaphor of the leaven could operate against the background of the redactor's thought in a number of unexpected but interrelated ways? One of these ways includes the aspect of leaven which may be called its 'total effectiveness'. A little leaven leavens the whole lump (1 Cor 5:6; Gal 5:9). The redactor seems to have been interested in the total conquest of evil; as the leaven affected the whole lump, so must the powers of the Kingdom be total in their effect (perhaps for both individual and community).[186] Again, once that aspect of the metaphor emerged, it would have been hard for the deeply rooted association of 'leaven' as evil to have been entirely suppressed. The Kingdom of Heaven is to be thought of as 'leaven affecting the whole lump'; which means that one right step leads, through the power of Christ and the Spirit, to a future of hope and success. But there is truth in the opposite case also: one wrong step leads to disaster.[187] The metaphor of 'leaven' hints at the contrast

---

183 Davies, *Matthew*, II 432.

184 See p.177 n.4.

185 Mt 13:18-32.

186 Jülicher, *Gleichnisreden*, II 579; Flusser, *Gleichnisse*, 206; Goulder, *Midrash*, 371; Scott, *Parable*, 327, on the inevitability of everything being corrupted, quoting Hos 7:4.

187 For the double use of leaven as on the one hand evil, and on the other hand good, see Ignatius, *Magnesians*, 10:2; also Davies, Matthew, II 422 n.72. According to Scott, *Parable*, 322-329, and Crossan, *Jesus*, 280, three factors in

between privilege and disaster which Matthew has intensified throughout his redactional work on Mt 13. The concluding metaphor of the extended parabolic grouping by its very ambiguity (see Mt 16:6,11,12) performs, within that wider grouping and the framework of the whole of Mt 13, an unexpectedly powerful function. It prepares the way for the hearing in 13:35 of the revelation of God's mysteries; at the same time it warns about the failure to 'hear' and of the difficulties hinted at in 13:34; they could lead to disastrous consequences.

(iii) *The Tradition*

The language of the parable is terse, the vocabulary curious, and the order of the words subtle.[188] This fully justifies Funk's description of the parable as a 'parsimonious encapsulation'.[189] Funk's additional phrase, that it is a parsimonious encapsulation 'of the horizons of Jesus' message',[190] is more questionable, since the effect which Funk notes need only be a Greek literary effect. It may be that Funk is right to suggest that the triple association of 'evil leaven', 'hidden in three measures of flour' and 'the Kingdom of Heaven' is intended to 'trigger the imagination',[191] but this need be true only for the Greek text.[192] Certainly there is no hint of this range of subtle associations in the Coptic versions or in the GThom version of *The Leaven*.[193] There is a danger too that Funk is reading too much into the Greek. He is not entirely fair to Jülicher when he presents the latter as quoting Ps 118:11, Prov 7:1 and Job 23:12 as evidence of 'a completely faded sense' for the Verb κρύπτω.[194] Jülicher only claims that the 'secrecy' associations can disappear.[195] He is correct in this, and the three passages are evidence of a metaphorical use of the Verb with the associations of

---

The Leaven have negative connotations in their social matrix: leaven, woman and hiding.

188 Funk, *Leaven*, 152-162.

189 Funk, *Leaven*, 167.

190 Funk, *Leaven*, 167f.

191 Funk, *Leaven*, 158-162.

192 The ideas and acts in the parable have a universality, according to Funk. He does not attempt to trace the Greek back to a Semitic form. σάτον could have an Aramaic background but it is used independently of any such original: e.g. Jos Ant 9:85.

193 In the Coptic version of the Matthean account there is evidence for the reading ⲁⲥϩⲟⲡϥ, but the Lucan reading (see Fieger, *Thomas*, 245) is probably ⲁⲥⲛⲟⲩϥ (for the Bohairic, see *Coptic Version: Luke*, 194). GThom 96 omits the three measures (with sy^{c} in Mt 13:33 and Old Latin in Lk 13:21: Schrage, *Thomas-Evangeliums*, 184-185).

194 Funk, *Leaven*, 158.

195 Jülicher, *Gleichnisreden*, II 578. κρύπτειν appears again in 13:35 and 44.

See p.312.

'keeping safe', rather than 'keeping hidden'. Funk is also on dangerous ground when he speaks of the parabolic text as 'foundational language' which may 'die a historical death, given a radical shift of sensibility'.[196] It is true that metaphors can be sociologically rooted in a particular situation and when the circumstances change, the force of the metaphor can change also. It is also true that a metaphor embodying a prophetic vision may change its function in calmer times. But it may well be that Funk is seriously underestimating the power of metaphor when he suggests that it must necessarily die with a change in sensibilities.[197]

(iv) *The History of the Parables*
This is a piece of tradition taken over by the evangelists without alteration. Its metaphorical centre has proverbial and religious associations, and its Greek vocabulary is concisely presented. Its Greek form does not automatically suggest that we should be looking for a precursor in some prior language of equal interest. On the contrary, it could be important in the study of the history of parables to give its Greek form, its rhythms and poetry, due weight and attention.

(v) *The History of Redaction*
The Matthean redactor has used a metaphor of considerable ambiguity at a structurally important place within the material. The theological interests which motivated Matthew, particularly a concern that the privileges and possible failure of Christians should be adequately recognized in the time before the End, made it possible for new aspects of the metaphor to emerge. The redaction indicates an awareness of how the metaphor 'came alive' in a new situation.

F. *The Interpretation of the Tares* Mt 13:36-43

(i) *The Context*
The introduction to this chapter raised the question why the Interpretation of *The Tares* stands in its present position. The Interpretation begins an additional section. The Marcan outline has been used up to and including the conclusion in Mark 4:33-34. Now Matthew continues with fresh material.[198] It is clear that Matthew could have included the Interpretation of

196 Funk, *Leaven*, 168.
197 Aurelio, *Disclosures*; Soskice, *Metaphor*, 71-83.
198 Kingsbury, *Parables*, 92ff, attributes a literary function to the house in 13:36; this establishes a setting for the private instruction of the disciples. The issue centres on what is meant by 'literary function'. Kingsbury appears to mean

The Tares either alongside the parable of *The Tares* or immediately before the Marcan conclusion, rather than in its present position after that conclusion. One explanation for the shape of ch. 13 might be that, as in the case of ch. 18,[199] Matthew intended to divide the discourse into two halves (in this case Mt 13:18-33 and 13:36-52), with the two halves roughly approximate to each other in length and order. Matthew followed Mark in using the statement about the purpose of parables (Mt 13:10-15) between the parable of *The Sower* and its Interpretation (Mt 13:1-9, 18-23), repeating the procedure in 13:24-43. Matthew then concluded the discourse with the group of three parables. The Interpretation of *The Tares* and the group of three parables may well have circulated together previous to Matthean redaction; they share a heightened emphasis on the fate of the disobedient, providing the second half of ch. 13 with material suited to private teaching (Mt 13:36) rather than to the public discourse (Mt 13:34).

(ii) *The Redaction*

A comparison[200] of the Interpretation of *The Tares* with the Interpretation of *The Sower* suggests that both emerged, as did the parable of *The Tares*, in the context of Marcan influence. The similarities of style and syntax between them make it likely that both are basically the product of tradition rather than of redaction.[201] It is in this context that the evidence concerning the vocabulary of Mt 13:36ff has to be assessed. Jeremias described Mt 13:36ff. as 'a simply unique collection of the linguistic characteristics of the Evangelist Matthew'.[202] But, of these, only two can, with qualifications, be classified as Matthean: τότε and οὖν.[203] The remainder are well attested in narrative formulae, disputed textually, from pre-Matthean contexts, or by

---

that 'house' in Mt 13:36 takes up the implication of the pericope on Jesus' true family that the house is the place of action. The assumption behind the idea of 'literary function' is therefore that Matthew is concerned to build a narrative in which each place and time flows naturally from what precedes. He is shaping a consequential narrative. The argument of this book is that the language of Matthew reveals a different kind of narrative, one which is written as a result of memorized material, and is consequently episodic. The detailed analysis of the opening of ch. 13 pointed in this direction. An analysis of 13:36 suggests a similar conclusion. Among the pointers which Kingsbury neglects are the agreements between Matthew and Mark (ἀφεὶς τοὺς ὄχλους Mt 13:36; ἀφέντες τὸν ὄχλον Mk 4:36), the agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark (see Neirynck, *Minor Agreements*, 95) and the formulae (including ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν; see Fuchs, *Untersuchungen*, 111-116).

199 See pp.111-113.

200 See pp.303-305.

201 See pp.301-302.

202 Jeremias, *Parables*, 82-83.

203 See p.232 n.205 (iv); for οὖν, see p.339 n.221.

the criteria used here are not proven as editorial in Matthew: τότε, ἀφείς,[204] οἱ ὄχλοι,[205] ἦλθεν,[206] εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν,[207] προσῆλθον[208] αὐτῷ, οἱ

---

[204] See p.318;
ἀφίημι Schenk, *Sprache*, 76; Gundry, *Matthew*, 642.
Mt 47x: 10x No Par; 16x Par Mk; 5x Diff Mk; 10x Par Lk; 5x Diff Lk; 1x Text?
Mk 37x: 16x Par Mt; 4x Diff Mt; 2x > Mt; 12x > ; 3x Text?
Lk 31x: 9x No Par; 10x Par Mk; 9x Par Mt; 2x Diff Mt; 1x Text?
The Verb covers a limited field in the NT: it is useful to compare it with the six major contexts of its use in Josephus: missiles, voice, death, finance, law, leaving.
1. FORGIVE (Law)
Mt 16x: 3x No Par; 6x Par Mk; 3x Diff Mk; 5x Par Lk
Mk 8x: 6x Par Mt; 1x > Mt; 1x >
Lk 15x: 5x No Par; 4x Par Mk; 5x Par Mt; 1x Diff Mt
2. ALLOW + Infinitive (Law)
Mt 5x: 3x No Par (1x + Infinitive); 1x Par Mk (+ Infinitive); 2x Par Lk (1x + Infinitive)
Mk 5x: 1x Par Mt; 3x > ; 1x > Mt
Lk 6x: 2x Par Mk; 2x Par Mt; 2x Diff Mt (Mt 1x ἐάω)
3. LEAVE (Leaving)
Mt 15x: 3x No Par; 7x Par Mk; 1x Diff Mk; 2x Par Lk; 2x Diff Lk
Mk 17x: 7x Par Mt; 3x Diff Mt; 7x >
Lk 10x: 4x No Par; 4x Par Mk; 2x Par Mt
4. LEAVE UNDONE (Leaving)
Mt 2x: 2x Diff Lk
5. LET HAVE (Law)
Mt 1x: 1x Diff Lk
6. LET BE (Law)
Mt 2x: 1x No Par; 1x Par Mk
Mk 1x: 1x Par Mt; 1x Diff Mt
Lk 1x: 1x No Par
7. YIELD UP (Death)
Mt 1x: 1x Diff Mk
8. REMIT (Finance)
Mt 1x: 1x No Par
9. LET OUT (Voice)
Mk 1x: 1x Diff Mt
The uses of the Participle ἀφείς (ἀφέντες):
Mt 7x: 3x No Par; 3x Par Mk; 1x Diff Mk (see Mk 12:12)
Mk 9x: 3x Par Mt; 3x Diff Mt; 3x >
Lk 3x: 2x No Par; 1x Par Mk.
It is hard, on the basis of the above statistics, to see any reason why the form ἀφείς should be regarded as redactional rather than traditional.

[205] p.235 n.208.

[206] Schenk, *Sprache*, 249; Gundry, *Matthew*, 644.
ἦλθον The forms of the Aorist Indicative of ἔρχομαι are used as follows:
Mt 35x: 10x No Par; 6x Par Mk; 9x Diff Mk; 2x Par Lk; 6x Diff Lk; 2x Text?

μαθηταὶ[209] αὐτοῦ, λέγων,[210] φράσον ἡμῖν τὴν παραβολὴν,[211] ἡ παραβολὴ τῶν ζιζάνιων,[212] τοῦ ἀγροῦ,[213] ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν,[214] ὁ

Mk 22x: 6x Par Mt; 7x Diff Mt; 2x > Mt; 2x >*; 5x >
Lk 31x: 15x No Par; 2x Par Mk; 2x Par Mt; 7x Diff Mk; 3x Diff Mt; 2x Text?

The interchange of usage indicated by these statistics does not favour a redactional judgment: see Mt 9x Diff Mk; 6x Diff Lk; Mk 7x Diff Mt; Lk 7x Diff Mk; 3x Diff Mt.

[207] Fuchs, *Untersuchungen*, 111-116.

[208] p.294 n.48.

[209] p.201.

[210] Hartman, *Testimonium Linguae*, 32-34, argues for a formularization process affecting Matthew's use of εἶπον. A source-critical analysis of the material confirms his judgment. The same may be said for the Participle λέγοντες: Neirynck, *Vocabulary*, 275-281; Fuchs, *Untersuchungen*, 85-94.

(i) The agreements between Mt and Lk against Mark; 18x
8:3; 8:25,27; 17:5,15; 20:30; 21:2; 21:9,23; 22:16,23; 24:3; 26:8(?); 26:27,39,68; 27:11,54;

(ii) Uses associated with προσέρχομαι: 8x
13:36; 14:15 (see Mk 6:35); 15:1; 18:1; 21:23 (see (i)); 26:17; 26:69; 28:18

(iii) Agreements between Matthew, Mark and Luke: 5x(8?)
8:2,31(?); 9:18(?); 16:13(?); 21:25; 22:24; 24:5; 26:70
Agreement between Matthew and Luke in non-Marcan sections: 2x
8:6; 15:11; Mt Diff Lk 5:2; Lk Diff Mt 7:19; 19:18; 19:20

(iv) The agreements of Mark and Luke against Matthew: 4x
Mk 1:27; 2:12; 3:11; 5:35

(v) Percentage λέγω distribution of Participles with reported speech:
Hartman, *Testimonium Linguae*, 32 n.1
[Mk/Mt = material in Mark with parallels in Matthew;
Mt/Mk = material in Matthew with parallels in Mark.]

	Mk	Mk(/Mt)	Mt(/Mk)	Mt–Q	MT
Participle λέγω	14	14	27	14	34
Compare the above with:					
Finite λέγω	56	54	25	39	24
εἶπον	30	32	47	48	42

See p.335 n.214 (2) for the link between εἶπον and ἀποκριθείς.

[211] There is a textual issue here: De Goedt, *Matt.XIII:36-43*, reads διασφησον, which is found in the New Testament only elsewhere at Mt 18:31. The evidence can be summarized as follows:

διασαφησον	The main Alexandrian authorities; 3/4 of the so-called 'Caesarean' Minuscules of von Soden's 1424 Family (see Metzger, *Commentary*, 46) Origen at Jn 13:43
φρασον	CDLW ℵ^2 O1O6 4C (Brock, *Fragment*, 227) 0233 0250 Majority of Minuscules; Origen elsewhere.

Marginally the Greek texts (0106 and the range of Families) favour φρασον. The evidence from the Versions is not easy to evaluate:

(i) Latin: Legg quotes enarra: a b ff^2 g^1 h q as evidence for διασαφησον.

κόσμος,[215] οὗτοι,[216] ἡ βασιλεία,[217] ὁ πονηρός,[218] ἡ συντέλεια αἰῶνος,[219] ὥσπερ,[220] οὖν,[221] οὕτως ἔσται,[222] τὸ σκάνδαλον,[223] ἡ

Apart from the unreliable h the weight of evidence rests on a and q, whose reading enarra in 15:15 is cited on behalf of φρασον by Legg, alongside narra in d e ff^2 g^1.

(ii) Syriac: Huck quotes ܫ ܡ and ܕܫ̈ܦ̈ for διασαφησον. But the evidence for this is highly questionable. The ܐܡܪ of ܕܐܡ could represent either διασαφησον or φρασον (see Lewis, *Old Syriac* 34; also Dan 2:4; Job 34:42; and Smyth, *Thesaurus Syriacus* 3326).

(iii) Coptic: Legg reads both ⲥⲁ and ⲃⲟ as evidence for φρασον.

ⲁⲥⲉ ⲃⲉⲗ is probably correctly placed by him.

On the whole it is probably best to read φρασον (with Jeremias, *Parables*, 66, against De Goedt) on the grounds of the Greek evidence. It is thus parallel to Mt 15:15. φρασον is either to be read in 15:15 as a redactional change (that is the usual solution), or as a recall of 13:36, or as a traditional formula to introduce parabolic interpretation.

[212] See p.325 n.157.

[213] Schenk, *Sprache*, 12; Gundry, *Matthew*, 641.

[214] See p. 334 n.219. The two main forms of association between εἶπον and ἀποκρίνομαι are:

1) ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν

Mt 20x: 7x No Par; 11x Diff Mk (12:48 Mt=Lk); 2x Diff Lk
Mk 5x: 4x Diff Mt (Par to Mk 9:19 Mt and Lk agree); 1x >
Lk 6x: 2x No Par; 1x Par Mk; 3x Diff Mk

2) ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ...εἶπεν

Mt 21x: 6x No Par; 1x Par Mk; 9x Diff Mk; 5x Diff Lk
Mk 6x: 5x Diff Mt; 1x >
Lk 10x: 14x No Par; 7x Diff Mk; 4x Diff Mt

A review of: 1) the Marcan equivalents to 11x Mt Diff Mk, and 2) the Marcan equivalents to 9x Mt Diff Mk, shows a greater variation of order, vocabulary and Particles in Mark and than in Matthew.

[215] κόσμος Schenk, *Sprache*, 219; Gundry, *Matthew*, 645; Neirynck, 272.

Mt 9x: 4x No Par; 2x Par Mk; 1x Diff Mk 1x; Diff Lk; 1x Text?
Mk 3x: 2x Par Mt; 1x Text?
Lk 3x: 1x Par Mk; 2x Diff Mt. See Lk 11:50 and Lk 12:30 >*Mt

οἰκουμένη Schenk, *Sprache*, 219; Gundry, *Matthew*, 641.

Mt 1x: 1x No Par
Lk 3x: 2x No Par; 1x Diff Mt (=1x κόσμος)

Attempts have been made to present the Matthean uses of κόσμος as a consistent pattern: Schenk, *Sprache*, 219; Kretzer, *Herrschaft*, 33. The assumption may well be mistaken: see Marguerat, *Monde*, 113ff. If 13:36-43 contains older traditions, some variation in the use of κόσμος might be anticipated; see Strecker, *Gerechtigkeit*, 160ff; Ogawa, *L'histoire*, 159f. If, as Schenk suggests, κόσμος always means 'humanity' in Matthew, then: 1) 13:38 does not provide the obvious sequence 'sower–field–seed'; 2) the unusual Lucan phrase τὰ ἔθνη τοῦ κόσμου in Lk 12:30 would not have needed alteration by Matthew (Mt 6:32); 3) it would be difficult to maintain the diachronic sense required for κόσμος by the parallel phrase ἕως τοῦ νῦν in 24:21 (relevant also to its Marcan parallel in Mk

13:19) as well as for κόσμος in 13:35; 4) 4:8 and 16:26 would be weakened to refer only to people rather than forms of control, as the context in each case requires. Above all it seems necessary, in view of 26:13, to see κόσμος as capable of implying for Matthew an area of mission (see also 5:14) and not only a place where scandals might arise (18:7).

[216] p.301 n.72.

[217] p.199 n.88.

[218] p.306 n.90.

[219] This phrase is one of the most complex in Matthew. It appears five times and not elsewhere in the New Testament, except in a similar form in Hebrews 9:26. Of the five uses, four are Mt No Par and one is Diff Mk. It is therefore usually classified as redactional. 1) The one Mt Diff Mk example is part of a longer phrase: τῆς σῆς παρουσίας καὶ συντέλειας τοῦ αἰῶνος (Mt 24:3). It replaces the Marcan phrase in Mk 13:4: ὅταν μέλλῃ ταῦτα συντελεῖσθαι πάντα. The Lucan parallel has γίνεσθαι without the implication that Luke avoided the lexical item συντελεῖσθαι (see Lk 4:31, and 4:2, both Lk Diff Mt). 2) συντέλεια in Mt 24:3 could well have been suggested by συντελεῖσθαι. However, the association of παρουσία with συντέλεια in Mt 24:3 shifts the meaning of the phrase dramatically. In Mark συντελεῖσθαι is linked with the fall of Jerusalem (Telford, *Barren Temple*, 217; Hooker, *Mark*, 306); παρουσία in Matthew points to a distant horizon (see the argument of Matthew 24-25). 3) The same is true of συντέλεια in Mt 28:20, although in both 24:3 and 28:20 moral preparedness for the end is an essential feature of the Matthean viewpoint (Trilling, *Wahre Israel*, 125). Certainly in 28:20, where the emphasis is on the enduring presence of Christ, the probability envisaged is that the period to be filled by such obedience will be an extended one (see Hubbard, *Matthew 28:16-20*, 97-98; Hummel, *Auseinandersetzung*, 160 n.85, argues against a long-term view). 4) In 13:39,40 and 49 συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος involves the expulsion of the bad and the harvest ingathering of the good. Time for amendment of life is offered (some suggest that this is to counteract pressure to purify the community immediately: Barth, *Kirchenzucht*, 158ff); but the harvest imagery carries a note of impending doom, as it does in John the Baptist's proclamation. Time is offered for repentance; but only a limited time. 5) Outside the New Testament there are two major areas where parallel phrases are to be found:

(i) There is a range of similar or identical phrases in the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Test Benjamin 11:3 has a long time-scale; Test Zebulun 9:9 is of uncertain sense; Test Levi 10:2 could approximate to Heb 9:26.

(ii) There is a parallel phrase in 1 QS 4:15ff: the significance of the phrase depends on translation questions: "These are the natures of all the sons of men, and in their different kinds all their hosts by their generations have a share and walk in their ways; and all the deeds of their behaviour are of their different kinds according to the share of each individual to a greater or lesser extent *to the ends of the ages*. For God 'put them in equal quantities' until the *final end*; and He set everlasting enmity between the different kinds. Acts of wrongdoing are an abomination to truth; all the ways of truth are an abomination to wrongdoing. And fierce conflict obtains between their manners, for they do not walk together. And God in the mysteries of his understanding and in his glorious wisdom appointed an end to the existence of wrongdoing; but *at the time of visitation* he will destroy it forever." The community recognizes the presence of evil within

---

the group, regards this as a temporary state ordained by God, and looks forward to the 'time of visitation'. (On the variant eschatologies in the Qumran MSS, see Mattila, *4Q246*, 518f.)

6) Several attempts have been made to distinguish between the five uses of συντελεία τοῦ αἰῶνος in Matthew. Feuillet, *Parousie*, 261-280, *Eschatologique*, 340-364, takes 24:3 to be a triumphant counterpart to the Cross, whereas he understands the other four uses to be references to the 'end of the world'. Despite criticisms (e.g. Tödt, *Menschensohn*, 81 n.125) Feuillet's suggestion that there are different nuances to the five uses deserves further discussion (Robinson, *Coming*, 124). In particular the phrase could refer to a short-term or a long-term future expectation. If 13:49ff represents a pre-Matthean source, there is no reason why Matthew should not have incorporated what was essentially a short-term expectation, even though he himself understood the Parousia to be a long-term one. 24:3 and 28:20 would then represent later uses of the phrase, setting out the long-term programme.

[220] Although Matthew's uses of ὡς are numerically greater than those in other Synoptic Gospels, the range of usage is narrower. There are no examples in Matthew of classical uses to be found in the LXX and in Luke, and a few of the modal uses (see 8) below) found in Mark and Luke are missing in Matthew. The most significant Matthean usage is the Matthean preference for ὡς with γίνομαι (see however Lk 2x Diff Mk). The metaphorical use is relatively prominent in Matthew as compared with the other Synoptics, but it requires great care to draw redactional conclusions from this. The use in subordinate causal clauses is good evidence of the retention of traditional source usage by Matthew. ὥσπερ is found introducing a simile only in 25:32. On 25:14, see p.464 n.183. Otherwise ὡς is always followed by οὕτως in what may properly be described as an apocalyptic judgment comparison.

ὡς Schenk, *Sprache*, 467; Gundry, *Matthew*, 649; Neirynck, *Vocabulary*, 333.
Mt 40x: 10x No Par; 5x Par Mk; 4x Par Lk; 12x Diff Mk; 4x Diff Lk; 3x No Par or Diff Mk; 1x No Par or Diff Lk; 1x No Par or Par Lk
Mk 20x: 5x Par Mt; 2x Diff Mt; 7x > ; 5x >*; > Mt
Lk 25x: 12x No Par; 4x Par Mk; 3x Diff Mk; 4x Par Mt; 2x Diff Mt
These 40 can be broken down into the following sub-categories:

	Matthew	**Mark**	**Luke**
1) Modal	3x No Par	1x Par Mt	-
	1x Par Mk	1x >	
	12x Diff Mk		
2) Simile	1x No Par	-	2x No Par
	2x Diff Mk		
	2x No Par or Diff Mk		
3) Identity	1x No Par	1x >	1x Diff Mt
	1x Par Lk		1x Par Mt
			1x No Par
4) Comparison			
(i)	4x Diff Mk		
	2x Par Mk	2x Par Mt	2x Par Mk
	1x No Par or Diff Mk		

(ii) With εἰμί I am (=LXX)			
	1x No Par	3x >	2x No Par
	2x Diff Lk		1x Diff Mt
	1x Par Mk	1x Par Mt	1x Diff Mk
			1x Diff Mt
(iii) With γίνομαι (=LXX)			
	3x No Par	-	2x Diff Mk
	2x Diff Mk		
	1x Diff Lk		
	1x No Par or Diff Mk		
	1x No Par or Diff Lk		
	1x No Par or Par Lk		
(iv) Nouns connected in comparison			
	1x No Par	1x Diff Mt	1x No Par
	2x Par Lk		2x Par Mt
	1x Par Mk		1x Par Mk
(v) 'כ veritatis'			
	2x Diff Mk		
5) Causal	1x No Par		
	1x Diff Lk		
6) Epexegetic	-	1x >	-
7) Numerative	-	2x >*	-
8) Hebraic Modal Use	-	1x >*	2x No Par
9) LXX 'Like'	-	1x >	-
10) 'as is fitting'	-	2x >*	2x No Par
11) LXX Syntax	-	1x Diff Mt	-
12) Subjective Use	-	-	2x No Par

These sub-categories correspond to Muraoka (see ch.4 p.223 n.174; Muraoka's numbers are given second): 1) = 1(iii); 2) = 1(ii); 3) = 1(vi)a; 4)(i,ii,iii) = 1(vi)bI; 4)(iv) = 1(vi)bII; 4)(vi) = 1(vi)f; 5) = 3(iii); 6) = 2; 7) = 4(vii); 8) = 1(v); 9) = 1(vi)d; 10) = 1(iv); 11) = 1(vi)e; 12) = 1(vii).

ὥσπερ Schenk, *Sprache*, 467; Gundry, *Matthew*, 649.

Mt 10x: 5x No Par; 1x Par Lk; 1x Diff Mk; 3x Par Lk

These can be broken down into:

(a)	Modal (see Category 1) above)	2x No Par	(Mt 6:2,7)
(b)	Apocalyptic Comparison (Category 4))	1x No Par	(with γάρ);
		1x Par Lk	(with γάρ);
		2x Diff Lk	(with γάρ)
(c)	Anacolouthon	1x Diff Mk	(Mt 20:28)
(d)	Collatio	1x No Par	(Mt 25:32)

Mk 0x

Lk 2x: 1x Par Mt (Apocalyptic Comparison; Lk 17:24 with γάρ);
1x No Par (Category 4(ii) above)

The use of ὥσπερ accompanied by οὕτως is frequent in the remainder of the NT (see Jn 5:21,26; Rom 5:12,19,21; 1 Cor 11:12). Category 4) is rare elsewhere: Acts 2:2; Category 12) is also rare: 1 Cor 8:5.

Summary: Mt 13:40 belongs to a clearly defined group of apocalyptic comparisons. The other Matthean uses indicate the possibility of some uses from available sources, and a strong LXX influence, especially in the use of Category 4)(ii) and (iii). The pattern of greater formulaic usage in Matthew is identifiable here.

[221] οὖν is used with ὥσπερ only here in the New Testament.
The uses of οὖν in Matthew are:

Mt 36x:

14x No Par

- 1:17 Resumptive, summary use, giving a single focus to the previous 16 verses;
- 6:8 Inclusio use, preparing for explanation;
- 6:34 Inclusio use, allowing new point to emerge;
- 13:40 Comparison drawing together previously mentioned features of the parable/Interpretation;
- 18:1 Summary of preceding sayings with generalized exposition of their significance;
- 18:26,29,31 Narrative parabolic uses, with a temporal use, unique to Matthew;
- 23:23; 24:42; 25:13 Advice on basic of preceding verses;
- 23:20 Inference from a discussion to a clear judgment;
- 27:64; 28:19 Command on a given basis.

1x Par Mk

- 19:6 Conclusion drawn from Scripture;

6x Diff Mk

- 13:18 Implying that what was said about parables has prepared the way for the Interpretation;
- 14:15 Advice on a given basis, leading to a directive;
- 22:17 Introducing a question with a request;
- 22:21 Advice given in dialogue after discussion;
- 22:28 Resumptive Particle underlining a fresh review and leading to question;
- 27:17 See Senior, *Passion*, 240.

3x Par Lk

- 3:8 After a rhetorical question and implying a response, making the command emphatic;
- 3.10 Conclusion to a group of sayings: 'So you must be aware that...';
- 9:38 Marking a concluding piece of advice.

12x Diff Lk

- 5:48 Conclusion to a group of sayings: 'So you understand why I say...';
- 6:9 Moving from negative aspects of the prayer to positive;
- 6:31 Recapitulation of 6:25; parallel to 6:8;
- 7:12 Summarizing rule, preparing for explanation;
- 7:24 Summary generalization leading to parable;
- 10:16 Concluding advice with further explanation;
- 10:26 Advice presenting a further aspect of the subject;

10:31 Recapitulating 10:26 (Lk >* οὖν);
10:32 Promise related to previous advice;
22:9 Advice given in a parable on previous basis;
25:27 'in that case' drawing out the implications of a previous speaker which ought to have been apparent;
25:28 Command based on a previous, unsatisfactory interview.

With a conditional sentence:
Mt 7x: No Par 2x (5:19; 5:23)
Diff Mk 1x (22:45 >*)
Par Lk 2x (6:23; 7:11)
Diff Lk 2x (6:22; 24:26 >*)
Mk 0x:
Lk 3x Par Mt 2x;
Diff Mt 1x

With ὅταν:
Mt 3x 1x No Par;
2x Diff Mk (21:40; 24:15 Diff ὅταν δὲ);

With an interrogative sentence
Mt 12x: 4x No Par (6:2; 13:27,28; 26:54)
2x Par Mk (21:25 >*Lk; 27:22)
4x Diff Mk (>* 13:56; 17:10; 19:7; 22:42)
2x Diff Lk (12:12; 12:26)
Mk 3x 2x Par Mt; 1x Text.
Lk 6x 2x No Par; 1x Diff Mk (also > Mt); 2x Diff Mt.

There is little doubt that οὖν is a feature of Matthean composition. The question is how that compositional technique emerged. The interrogative sentences illustrate a development parallel to the familiar pattern of formularization. It is possible that the Par Lk/Diff Lk uses are also evidence of a similar pre-Matthean pattern. There is also little doubt that the οὖν is often more strongly inferential and less often temporal in the Synoptists than some grammarians imply (Turner, *Grammar*, 227; Blass, Debrunner, Funk, *Grammar*, 234, §451), although the inferential element is often diffuse, and the temporal usage resembles the English narrative 'so...' rather than any stronger temporal implication.

[222] In addition to the comparisons considered in n.220, there is also a parabolic conclusion accompanying such comparisons, marked by οὕτως: Mt 12:28 (Par Lk); 12:45 (Diff Lk); 13:49 (No Par); 18:14 (No Par); 18:35 (No Par); 20:16 (No Par); 24:27 (Par Lk); Mk 13:29 (Par Mt and Lk); Lk 15:7 (Diff Mt); Lk 12:21 (No Par).

οὕτως Schenk, *Sprache*, 390; Gundry, *Matthew*, 646.
Mt 33x: 19x No Par; 2x Par Mk; 1x Diff Mk; 6x Par Lk; 4x Diff Lk; 1x Text?
Mk 10x: 2x Par Mt; 5x > Mt; 3x Diff Mt
Lk 21x: 10x No Par; 2x Par Mk; 6x Par Mt; 2x Diff Mk; 1x Diff Mt

οὕτως καὶ
Mt 6x: 3x No Par; 1x Par Mk; 1x Diff Mt; 1x Text?
Mk 2x: 1x Par Mt; 1x Diff Mt
Lk 2x: 1x No Par; 1x Par Mk

ἀνομία,[224] ἡ κάμινος τοῦ πύρος,[225] ἐκεῖ ἔσται,[226] ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς, οἱ δικαίοι,[227] ὡς ὁ ἥλιος,[228] ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκουέτω.[229]

Initially the Interpretation of *The Tares* belonged to the same context as the Interpretation of *The Sower*. The purpose for which the Interpretation of *The Tares* was probably threefold; it was designed to provide, by means of an interpretation of the parable, a defence against excluding sinners from the company of the righteous, the offer of time in which to make amends and a strengthened warning not to abuse the offer.[230] Each of these functions was taken up by Matthew 13. The first part of Mt 13 was concerned with high privilege and possible poor results. The second section contrasts the fate of

---

οὕτως + εἰμί

Mt 13x: 8x No Par; 1x Par Mk; 3x Par Lk; 1x Diff Lk
Mk 4x: 1x Par Mt; 2x > Mt; 1x Diff Mt
Lk 5x: 2x No Par; 3x Par Mt

The same issue arises here as in the case of ὡς: how did the Matthean development arise which is signalled by these usages?

[223] p.214 n.135 (i).

[224] p.214 n.135 (iii)

[225] De Goedt, *Matt.XIII:36-43*, 37 seems correct here: "rien ici d'un matthéisme"; Strecker, *Gerechtigkeit*, 160 n.2, 235 nn.4-5. This LXX expression (quoted in 1 Clement 45:7; see Dan 3:6,1,20; for the longer phrase from Daniel, see Davies, *Matthew*, II 430; of the place of punishment, see Lk 16:23; 4 Esdras 7:36) is particularly interesting in view of the alternative expression used in Mt 6:30/Lk 12:28.

πῦρ Schenk, *Sprache*, 425; Gundry, *Matthew*, 647.

Mt 12x: 6x No Par; 2x Par Mk; 1x Diff Mk; 2x Par Lk; 1x Diff Mk or Par Lk
Mk 4x: 2x Par Mt; 2x >
Lk 7x: 4x No Par; 2x Par Mt; 1x Diff Mk or Par Mt

Some argue that πυρός is an editorial addition, quoting Mt 5:22 (No Par) and Mt 18:9 (Diff Mk). But there is no Matthean consistency in the terms used for the Final Judgment; see Mk 9:43 Diff Mt 18:8; Mk 9:47 Diff 18:9; also Legg, *Matthew*, ad loc. The most likely explanation of Mt 5:22 and 18:9 is an assimilation of the second of the two to the first. πυρός in 13:31 means 'of the fire of judgment' rather than 'blazing' (Moulton, *Grammar*, III 213).

[226] Mt 8:12/Lk 13:28.

[227] Hill, *Dikaioi*, 296-302. It is difficult to avoid the inference that in 10:41 a special group is in mind, and that in ch.13 the reference is different. See Schenk, *Sprache*, 192, for its Wisdom background.

[228] De Goedt, *Matt.XIII:36-43*, 37, is probably right. The two metaphors which belong to the second half of the Interpretation are both Danielic. The strength of the metaphorical tradition in Wisdom writings may point to the roots of the parabolic material: see Sir 50:7ff. On Mal 3:20, see Derrett, *Law*, 15; on Dan 12:3, see Kingsbury, *Matthew 13*, 100. The appearance of the same phrase in Mt 17:2 during the Matthean version of the Transfiguration is complicated by Minor Agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark. On the textual issue, see Zaphiris, *Matthieu*, 613.

[229] See Mt 13:9.

[230] See p.113.

the righteous and of the wicked more sharply, as in 25:31-46,[231] except that 13:36-43 specifies that sinners are to be allowed to remain until the 'end of the age', and only then will they be separated from the righteous, and only by the Son of Man (or his angels). The role of the Interpretation of *The Tares* in Matthew 13 can therefore be viewed from a negative and from a positive point of view. On the negative side, the early part of the chapter warns the sinner to repent because of the slippery path to destruction; the second half warns that sinners should not be rejected in advance of the last judgment but stresses the extreme nature of that Final Judgment. On the positive side, the first part presents the privileges of the Kingdom now; and the second half envisages the glorious privileges of the righteous in the future Kingdom.

(iii) *The Tradition*

The reference to 25:31-46 illustrates the value of comparing and constrasting 13:36-43 with other sections of Matthew.

1. In 13:36-43 the relation of the Son of Man to the world is presented in terms of the calling of the good, over against the damnation of the bad. [232] The importance of this presentation can be seen when it is compared: first, with the Sermon on the Mount (Mt 5-7), where the explicit context for judgment is the providence of the Father, whereas in 13:43 it is hardly even implicit; and second, with 25:31-46, where the relation of the Son of Man to the world is presented in terms of his oneness with the oppressed; he is the suffering and judging Son of Man who judges all nations by the standards he embodied;[233] by implication those judged are aware of the standards, and this is a matter of divine providence.

Kretzer deals with these contrasts by suggesting that the world is the area of the Son of Man's activity.[234] As such it must experience the 'word of the Kingdom' (26:13; 13:35; 25:34) as it experiences also σκάνδαλα (18:7). The terms used in 28:18 imply that the κόσμος is the realm of the Kurios (13:24,27). Nevertheless, argues Kretzer, a time factor distinguishes the κόσμος from the Son of Man's Kingdom, since the end of the age alone, with its universal proclamation and the breaking of Satan's power, will see

---

231 See p.249.

232 The interpretation of the good seed as 'children of the Kingdom' is unexpected following 13:19 (Kretzer, *Herrschaft*, 132). Kretzer maintains a connecting link between 13:19 and 13:38 in the word of the Kingdom; those who respond to it are children of the Kingdom. It is not clear that this was the connecting link. The distinction between the two groups goes back to a basic dualism, and moral character is required of those called to salvation (Kingsbury, *Matthew 13*, 100; and ch. 4 n.298).

233 pp.259-264.

234 Kretzer, *Herrschaft*, 139.

the κόσμος as the Son of Man's kingdom.[235] Kretzer's attempt to make all the Matthean material fit a single pattern[236] fails to do justice either to later passages in chs. 25 and 26 or to the specific character of the text in front of him in 13:36ff. One possible way of drawing together some of the relevant strands of Matthean editorial eschatology is as follows: κόσμος does not mean 'cosmos' in 13:38; it is the world,[237] i.e. the place where righteousness and unrighteousness are practised, where the standards embodied by the Son of Man can be fulfilled or denied, but in either case remain sovereign. As Kretzer recognizes, the ethical aspect is vitally important; from an ethical point of view the world has a dual character (13:38,41), but it belongs to God and in it the Son's standards are secure.

2. In 13:36-43 the relation of the Son of Man to the Kingdom is twofold: the Son of Man sows the seed and the seeds are the children of the Kingdom (13:38); second, it is the Son of Man who initiates the removal of the unrighteous. In 25:31-46 the relation of the Son of Man to the Kingdom is presented in terms of judgment over all the nations, with the distinction between sheep and goats made according to the six criteria of judgment.

Kretzer suggests three reasons for this relationship in 13:41: it is eschatological in the sense that it points to his future glory; it is personal in its ethic; it is spatial in that the Son of Man and the Kingdom are both present, albeit in a hidden form.[238] But Kretzer does not recognize that the

---

235 Kretzer, *Herrschaft*, 147.

236 Kretzer, *Herrschaft*, 197ff, does not present a static picture, but he does find a single pattern of thought in the eschatological sections.

237 See p.335 n.215.

238 Kretzer, *Herrschaft*, 143. The key issue is the association of the Son of Man with the Kingdom (Tödt, *Menschensohn*, 62-68; Schnackenburg, *Herrschaft*, 115f; Casey, *Son of Man*, 186). This association is found only in 13:41 and 16:28 (Diff Mk), and in both passages the Kingdom is explicitly called 'his'. The 'angels' too are designated 'his' in 13:41 (contrast 13:49, 19:28, 25:31), and it is they who do the sifting of good from bad in 13:41 and 13:49. His last point distinguishes 13:41 from the similar material in 19:28 and 25:31f. There are possible ways forward: 1) It is possible to separate the Matthean uses of 'Kingdom' in an absolute sense into groups, classifying one or other of them as editorial (Trilling, *Wahre Israel*, 119ff). The difficulty in this case is that these uses could belong to different traditions and need not represent a single theological outlook. 2) It is possible to describe the three functions of the Son of Man in Matthew as Teacher, Lord of the Church and Coming Judge (Jeremias, *Parables*, 65; Jeremias's response in *Mt 13,36-43* to De Goedt's challenge in *Matt.XIII:36-43*, 36, is justified; none of De Goedt's examples from Luke explicitly mentions the Son of Man. However, the introductory remarks to this note indicate nuances within the passages dealing with Son of Man as Judge. 3) It is possible to give particular attention to the groups of motifs (his 'angels') and the relationship of the key ideas (13:41; 16:28; 20:21) without suggesting that these are any more than hints of levels in the tradition. For the

range of 'righteousness' in Matthew's theology, as represented by 25:31-46, differs from the range of the interest expressed in 13:41;[239] nor does he take account of the different relation between those judged in 25:31-46 and the righteous and unrighteous in 13:38.

3. 13:36-43 and 25:31-46 agree in one important respect. They both make clear the relation between the Son of Man and the Father. In both passages the righteous enter into the Kingdom prepared by *their* father (13:43; 25:34) and the judgment of the Son of Man is made not in his own name, but with reference to the Father's Kingdom.[240] It could be that 13:41 reflects a two-stage understanding of the Kingdom: the Son of Man's Kingdom, and the Father's Kingdom. If so, there is nothing corresponding to that view in 25:31-46.[241]

Those three comparisons and contrasts between the Interpretation of the Tares and other sections of Matthew's Gospel are a measure of how difficult it is to bring 13:36-43 into line with the Gospel as a whole. The judgment that 13:36-43 is not necessarily redactional, and that it has been integrated into the general perspective of the Chapter of Parables, sets the reader of Matthew free to examine what the text is actually saying in all its remarkable variety and power.

---

identification of the Kingdom of the Son of Man with the church, see Vögtle, *Mt 28,18-20*, and in response Dupont, *Le point de vue*, 227ff.

The ambiguity of this section in 13:41ff has to be faced (Trilling, *Wahre Israel*, 128), as also its distinctiveness (why did Matthew not express himself more clearly and express himself in this way elsewhere in the Gospel?). Perhaps the redactor found ambiguity to his taste. He could take over apocalyptic references to the Kingdom and understand these in his own way, as witness to the lordship of God's vice-gerent. Why he should retain such traditions which needed reinterpretation will be discussed in the next section.

239 Only in 25:31 is the universal range of righteousness affirmed in detail.

240 That is not to say that the Father's eternal purpose is necessarily to be viewed in 13:43 as it is in 25:31ff. The eternal purpose of God could be understood in relation to the ultimate resolution of the present conflict of good and evil. But n.233 above shows that 25:31ff takes us into deeper Christological waters.

241 Kretzer, *Herrschaft*, 140, prefers to speak of an eschatological scheme of promise, fulfilment and completion rather than a clear division between two Kingdoms. The phrase 'their Father's', rather than 'his Father's', justifies his caution. Had Matthew intended a clear separation of the two Kingdoms he could have made this evident by using the third-person Singular. Nevertheless even an eschatological scheme such as Kretzer suggests does not meet the difficulty that the eschatology of 1 Cor 15:28 could be read into Mt 13:43 but not into 25:31f.

(iv) *The History of the Parables*

The earlier study of the parable of *The Tares*[242] placed the origin of the Interpretation of *The Tares* at the point when *The Tares* was created. *The Tares* was grouped with other Q parables as part of a warning against a discipline within the church which did not allow for repentance and change of practice. The interpretation was used within the same context. It is parallel in method to that of the Interpretation of *The Sower.* Like the latter it is strongly paraenetic and apocalyptic.

(v) *The History of Redaction*

The theological picture which emerges from a comparison of 13:36-43 with 25:31-46 confirms the literary judgment that 13:36-43 represents a tradition to which Matthew was heir, but one which he himself incorporated into a richer framework. The tradition was used to confront the faithful with the need to allow room for repentance, and yet at the same time to indicate the seriousness of disobedience and injustice. Matthew found such a tradition important for his purposes. The policy needed deepening, for example by reference to the motives and attitudes behind righteousness and justice. But 13:36-43, like 13:47-50, represented a policy, if not a theological framework, Matthew could incorporate, with its apocalyptic emphases, into his total work.

Within the final redaction of the Gospel the bringing together of material which represented different forms of community discipline undoubtedly produced severe frictions. Communities which were not accustomed to the immediate disciplining and even expulsion of one of their number would have reacted strongly against what they would have judged to be high-handed and authoritarian procedures. The Interpretation of *the Tares*, although not originally designed for that specific purpose, because of its emphasis on taking evil seriously but leaving judgment to the Lord at the end of time, would have been seen as a welcome alternative to 18:15-17.

---

[242] See p.312.

G. *The Treasure* Mt 13:44.

(i) *The Context*

The openings of the three parables which follow 13:36-43 are parallel to each other. This may perhaps indicate a pre-Matthean group. The second of the three is different in that the Kingdom is likened to a person; in *The Treasure* and *The Net* it is likened to that with which the person operates. The first two are also distinctive in their common reference to 'selling everything' and 'buying', although the tenses differ.[243] The question is whether they are intended to reinforce and to complement each other.[244]

(ii) *The Redaction*

A number of scholars have suggested Matthean composition for the parable.[245] However, the language is traditional: θησαυρός,[246] ὁμοία,[247] κρύπτω,[248] ἀπὸ τῆς χαρᾶς,[249] ὃν εὑρών,[250] ὑπάγει,[251] ὅσα ἔχει,[252] ἀγοράζω.[253]

---

[243] Linnemann, *Gleichnisse*, 105-107. On the Present tenses, see Eichholz, *Gleichnisse*, 116; Jeremias, *Parables*, 199 n.34; Weder, *Gleichnisse*, 138.

[244] Dupont, *Trésor*, 414-416; Hill, *Matthew*, 237; see Sider, *Treasure*, 360ff.

[245] Goulder, *Midrash*, 372, suggests that the language is evidence of an association of the parable with Mk 10:21, glossed by Mk 4:22. But this would mean a sense for the parable more closely linked with Mt 13:28f than with 19:17 (as Goulder prefers).

[246] Crossan, *Treasure*, 359ff; also *Finding*.

[247] See p.177 n.4.

[248] κρύπτω

In Matthew all the uses are parabolic except 11:25. Schenk, *Sprache*, 327; Gundry, *Matthew*, 645.

Mt	5:14	No Par	The City on the Hill
	13:35	No Par	Ps 77:2 The open proclamation by parables
	13:44	No Par	(2x)
	25:18	Diff Lk	*The Talents*
	25:25	Diff Lk	*The Talents*
	11:25	Diff Lk	(Lk ἀποκρύπτω)
Lk	13:21	Diff Mt	(Mt ἐγκρύπτω)
	18:34	No Par	
	19:42	No Par.	

Kingsbury, *Matthew 13*, 114. The use of κρύπτω in proximity to 11:25 and 12:18-21 may influence the first use in Mt 13:44. But the second use then produces a change of direction in the use of the Verb.

[249] χαρὰ Schenk, *Sprache*, 461; Gundry, *Matthew*, 649.

Mt 6x: 2x No Par; 1x Par Mk; 1x Diff Mk; 2x Diff Lk

Mk 1x: 1x Par Mt

Lk 8x: 6x No Par; 1x Par Mk; 1x Diff Mt or No Par

See p.476 n.219. Mt 28:8 (Diff Mk) has close parallels in 24:41,52.

χαίρω Schenk, *Sprache*, 460; Gundry, *Matthew*, 649.

Links have been noted between this parable and Mk 10:21 but that particular parallel does not explain either the text or the distinctive context of the parable, which lies in its double reference to commerce. On the one hand it urges giving up everything for treasure; on the other it presents the need for commercial astuteness in the process.[254] Had Matthew wished to write a parable commending poverty for the sake of the Kingdom he would not have made the field in which the treasure was found owner-property.[255] Because the man hid the treasure again after he found it (ὃν εὑρὼν ἄνθρωπος ἔκρυψεν),[256] an awareness of the moral and legal difficulties of possessing the treasure is sketched into the parable structure; unnecessarily and confusingly so, if the author's intention was simply to commend poverty. Against the bewilderingly rich background of the use of this parabolic theme, Matthew's parable appears to be a warning of the dangers

---

Mt 6x: 2x No Par; 2x Par Lk
1x Diff Mk (of Address); 1x Par Mk (of Address)
Mk 2x: 1x Diff Mt (ἔστησαν); 1x Par Mt (of Address)
Lk 12x: 9x No Par; 1x Par Mk; 2x Par Mt

It is not clear what weight should be attached to this feature of the narrative. Some regard it as central: Jeremias, *Parables*, 198f; Jüngel, *Paulus*, 143; Rustad, *Law*, 202f; others deny its centrality: Wilkens, *Redaktion*, 308ff; others regard it as ambiguous: Scott, *Parable*, 393ff. On the Genitive αὐτοῦ as subjective, see Faccio, *Thesauro*, 240.

250 εὑρίσκω. Schenk, *Sprache*, 269; Gundry, *Matthew*, 644; Neirynck, *Vocabulary*, 255.

Mt 26x: 11x No Par; 5x Par Mk; 7x Par Lk; 2x Diff Mk; 1x Diff Lk
Mk 11x: 5x Par Mt; 2x > Mt; 3x > ; 1x Text?
Lk 47x: 27x No Par; 4x Par Mk; 1x Diff Mk; 7x Par Mt;
5x No Par or Diff Mk; 1x No Par or Diff Mt; 2x Text?

251 Ch.1 p.19 n.19.

252 In view of Mk 10:21 ὅσα ἔχεις Diff Mt τὰ ὑπάρχοντα (see also Lk 18:22, which agrees with Mark against Matthew) it would be difficult to argue that the phrase here is redactional. The MS evidence for πάντα is differently weighted in v44 from v46 and has only Western support in Mt 19:21. The Western omission of the inclusive πάντα in 13:46 speaks for its authenticity there. The absence of any inclusive term in Mk 10:21 and the possibility of repetition in v44 and v46 is a further argument against the dependence of 13:44,46 on Mk 10:21. For the refrain character of the section, see Flusser, *Gleichnisse*, I 129.

253 ἀγοράζω Schenk, *Sprache*, 10; Gundry, *Matthew*, 641.

Mt 7x: 5x No Par; 2x Par Mk
Mk 5x: 2x Par Mt; 3x >
Lk 5x: 1x No Par; 1x Par Mk; 1x > ; 2x Diff Mt

The use in Allegorization is Mt 4x Lk 2x; see also πωλέω and πιπράσκω.

254 Derrett, *Law*, 3ff; Dauvillier, *Trésor*, 107ff; Linnemann, *Gleichnisse*, 104; Magass, *Schatz*, 2ff; Scott, *Parable*, 398f; W.D. Davies considers that the evidence from the text is inadequate: see *Matthew*, II 436.

255 Crossan, *Finding*, 75f, 91f.

256 Derrett, *Law*, 13.

of wealth; but the story also assumes in the hearer a canny degree of commercial interest and expertise.[257] This is an aspect of the parable which will receive more attention later.

Also written into the parable are two features: the great value of the treasure and the enormous difficulty involved in getting it. The picture in the parable corresponds to the Kingdom, so the parable concerns, as 13:36-43 did, the value of the Kingdom and the difficulty of gaining it.[258] Since the difficulty in gaining the Kingdom is, in Matthew's terms, moral and ethical, the parable of *The Treasure*, which might otherwise seem to be about other-worldliness, actually concerns this-worldly behaviour.[259] If the demands of the Kingdom are to be met, financial and legal matters cannot be avoided. The parable may well indicate the goods and values which are to be put at risk, when the attainment of the Kingdom is at stake. But in its Matthean context it may also hint at the fascination of the commercial context in which the Kingdom's values have to be realized.[260]

(iii) *The Tradition*

Stories of the finding of treasure were widespread in the Ancient Orient. Hellenistic fables, rabbinic and literary examples from the first century CE provide a variety of different plots about finding treasure, and these help in the accurate placing of any particular treasure-trove story within the thought of the ancient world.[261] They also point to the deep impact made by discovery stories on human consciousness,[262] and to elements in the structure of human existence to which such stories appeal.[263] Crossan identifies the Matthean form of the plot as one in which the finder has no formal claim to the treasure,[264] although Crossan is uncertain precisely how the plot should end. The difficulty is caused by the existence of two versions, the Matthean version in 13:44-46 and the GThom parable in Logion 109. They both involve a scandalous outcome. In Matthew, if the

---

257 Derrett, *Law*, 13.

258 From this point of view the parable of *The Treasure* is closer to the concerns of *The Tares* and its Interpretation than has sometimes been suggested.

259 Astute business ability is affirmed by the narrative level of the parable.

260 The interpretation of this parable could be dependent on the unexpectedness of the opportunity (Kulp, *Schatz*, 145ff) or on the value of the Kingdom or on sacrifice, risk or investment (Mealand, *Poverty*, 80ff). But the demand which is made is not only that of renunciation, and not only renunciation from those who are disciples. The demand is to use the privileges of the Kingdom and, in the security afforded by the Kingdom, to use material resources in the service of the Kingdom.

261 Crossan, *Finding*

262 Crossan, *Finding*, 46f.

263 Crossan, *Finding*, 113ff; Magass, *Schatz*, 2ff; Madsen, *Parabeln*, 147.

264 Crossan, *Finding*, 66f, 101ff.

treasure belongs to the finder, buying the land is unnecessary; but if the treasure does not belong to the finder, buying the land was unjust. In Logion 109 the scandal is of a different kind. The one who buys the land owns the treasure, but he uses it for what (according to the Gospel of Thomas) is an unnacceptable profession; he uses it for money-lending. Crossan cannot accept Matthew 13:44-46 and GThom Logion 109 as both attestations of the original parable,[265] but concludes that, however the plot originally ended, it provided a scandalous association for the Kingdom. *The Treasure* offers the same kind of disturbing associations for the Kingdom which *The Mustard Seed, The Leaven* and *The Tares* did.[266] It represents the threefold process of advent, reversal and action, the coming of the Kingdom, the undoing of the old values, and new possibilities opened up.

The GThom Logion has a prior history; the likelihood that the Gospel of Thomas placed Logion 108 in a series with 109 and 110 to counter the implied approval of money-lending is strong evidence for the early origin of Logion 108; and Crossan is wise to avoid the assumption that the two versions are divergent attestations for the same parable. He may well also be right to emphasize the astuteness by which the finder of the treasure trove secured the treasure. But there is a danger in this line of approach which is illustrated by Brandon Scott's interpretation of the parable:[267] there is a corrupting aspect to the Kingdom, revealed as the joy of the discoverer leads him inadvertently to impoverish himself for a treasure he dare not dig up. This distinctive voice which Brandon Scott hears in the parables[268] rests in the end on two assumptions: the first is the reliability of the nuances which might be caught from the Greek text of Matthew; the second is an assumption that the Thomas logion has an authentic, not just a pre-Thomas, ending.

The characteristics of the Matthean parable hardly support the first of these assumptions. The parable in Mt 13:44 has five equal-length phrases, each specifying a fresh factor in the plot, introduced by a comparison. The economy of language is striking; enough is said to complete the picture without a wasted word. A precise parallel to this form and style is hard to come by. There is a strong possibility that the Greek Gospel tradition gave it coinage.[269]

As far as the Gospel of Thomas is concerned, the movement from an early form of the parable to the authentic form is a major step. The immensity of the step is evident already in the diversity of material available to illustrate

---

265 Crossan, *Finding*, 65.
266 Crossan, *Jesus*, 276ff.
267 Scott, *Parable*, 402f.
268 Scott, *Parable*, 65ff.
269 Funk, *Parables*, 43ff.

the treasure-trove parables.[270] The brevity of these particular examples lends itself to expansion. It is a type of parable which by its structure is open to a very wide range of interpretations, especially when it is used in different contexts.

Its openness is illustrated also by its metaphorical aspect. There is a link created by the metaphors in the Matthean *The Treasure* and *The Pearl*. *The Treasure* in GThom Logion 109 is preceded by the logion on 'What is hidden' and followed by the logion on 'Renouncing wealth'.[271] Aristides in his use of the parable relates the parable to practical righteousness: 'They do not proclaim in the ears of the multitudes the kind deeds they do, but are careful that no one should notice them; and they conceal their giving just as he who finds a treasure and conceals it.'[272] Clement of Alexandria brings together Mt 12:35 and 13:44: 'As then treasure is not one with Him, as also it is with us, that which gives the unexpected great gain in the finding, but also a second, which is profitless and undesirable, an evil acquisition, hurtful.'[273] Tatian contrasts the final possession of the treasure with present indignities endured in its search,[274] and Irenaeus makes Christ the treasure.[275] The Acts of Peter and the Acts of John use treasure in a 'symbolic title form'.[276] In all these cases and in much of the post-biblical period the metaphor is the dominant feature of the parable.[277]

Against the background of such a powerful metaphor, to select one particular version of *The Treasure* parable and to claim that it has the authentic point of the original parable is a considerable risk. There is only one arguable and somewhat speculative point of agreement between Matthew 13:44ff and GThom 109, and a host of important differences.[278]

(iv) *The History of the Parables*

This similitude is used by the redactor, probably in the form which he received it (see the form of *The Pearl*), to allow the hearer to reflect on the character of the reward and on the cost of reaping it. Attention to its detail produces an unexpected aspect to this reward and its cost. It is a form which

---

270 Hedrick, *Poetic Fictions*, 117-141, argues for an original parable based on his re-translation of Logion 109. His use of ⲁϥⲉⲓ ⲉϥⲥⲕⲁⲉⲓ as evidence of a Semitic background is speculative and unnecessary; the more likely translation is 'he went and while ploughing (found) the treasure'.

271 Wrege, *Überlieferung*.

272 Aristides, *Apology*, 16.

273 Clement of Alexandria: *Who is the rich man that shall be saved?* 17.

274 Tatian, *Address to the Greeks*, 30.

275 Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, 2.26.

276 Acts of Peter 20; Acts of John 109.

277 Luz, *Matthäus*, 2 350f.

278 Davies, *Matthew*, II 437.

does not function on two separate levels: an everyday level and the level of the Kingdom. The level of this narrative, stylized and particularized as it is, can be the level at which the promise of the Kingdom and its cost are relevant. It is a similitude which operates in a manner parallel to that of the aphorism. Apparently accepting the everyday as a model by which to understand life, this parable puts a subtle question mark against the normal axioms of daily life and encourages the hearer to accept responsibility for personal decision and action. In the middle of ordinary human affairs, such as those involving finance and the marketplace, the parable in its new setting spurs the hearer to rise to new challenges. Its metaphorical aspect enables the hearer to catch of a glimpse of the range of such decision and action. All these features of the parable, when they are put together, suggest that the similitude has moved into a new dimension.

(v) *The History of Redaction*

Matthew has given the parable a context which draws attention to the level of the narrative not only as it relates to the Kingdom, but as it relates to the level on which the Kingdom must be won. But the word 'won' is only a part of the paradox to be found in this Matthean parable and in its present context. 'Treasure', 'find', 'hidden' are evocative enough to associate the strenuous exertions required to win the Kingdom with the privilege and possibilities of the search. The redactor was aware of the potential of metaphors and their fields of reference. The writer saw aesthetic and poetic aspects of metaphor as serving a redactional purpose. The Matthean redactor was aware that the parabolic form was part of the stimulus offered by the Jesus tradition to meet and match the privileges and responsibilities of discipleship.

H. *The Pearl* Mt 13:45-46

(i) *The Context*

There are similarities between *The Treasure* and *The Pearl*: they have the same introductory phrase; they have in common the selling of everything and the buying of the one thing desired. But the differences are numerous too:[279] the Dative of the person not of the thing, the tenses, αὐτόν for ἐκεῖνον, the reward of diligence and the style of the bargain made.[280] They form a pair of parables, but they do not have a twin format.

---

[279] Glombitza, *Perlenkaufmann*,153-161.

[280] Glombitza also suggests ὅσα for πάντα ὅσα, but see n.252 above. See also Dupont, *Trésor*, 409 n.4.

(ii) *The Redaction*

It is hardly likely that a redactor who sought uniformity within his material could have been responsible for the creation of these two parables. Their variations are too striking. They have variant tradition histories. Nevertheless as a pair they betray a different history of tradition from that of the two parables *The Mustard Seed* and *The Leaven*. They share a common construction with them; they may have formed a grouping of parables with them. But these two sets of parables, *The Treasure* and *The Pearl*, and *The Mustard Seed* and *The Leaven*, at an earlier stage of the synoptic tradition exhibited variations of form and structure and could become part of a larger collection, retaining something of their own identity and detail in different ways and to different degrees.

One of the variations, briefly alluded to above, is that in *The Pearl* the person who 'finds' appears to have a more active role. It is in fact a relatively unimportant variation, since in both parables the Kingdom is won at the cost of hard work. The two pictures, that of the treasure and the pearl, are different: accidental finding/diligent searching.[281] But they are complementary: *The Treasure* concerns enterprise as well as finding, and the pearl merchant can be seen spending all on a single enterprise and so, for a single find, eclipsing all his previous hard work.[282] The initial impression of variant emphases is misleading. The actors in both parables win their prize at the cost of hard work, although not by hard work alone.[283]

The parable in Matthew of *The Pearl*, like the parable of *The Treasure*, has to be heard against the GThom version.[284] It has been argued that Matthew presents a merchant travelling the seas, who, captivated by one pearl, sells all his goods to buy a pearl; he would never be satisfied without it. Thomas, by contrast, it is suggested, presents a small merchant peddling his wares who prudently sold merchandise in order to run his business with quality material.[285] The GThom Logion 76[286] is however capable of a different interpretation. ⲁⲧⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛⲉⲩⲱⲱⲧ' ⲉⲧⲛⲧⲁϥ' ⲙⲙⲁⲧ ⲛⲟⲧⲫⲟⲣⲧⲏ ⲟⲛ ⲉⲁϥϩⲉ ⲁⲧⲙⲁⲣⲅⲁⲣⲓⲧⲏⲥ could well mean 'a merchant who was

281 Lohmeyer, *Matthäus*, 227; Jeremias, *Parables*, 200; Grundmann, *Matthäus*, 373, especially n.7, which finds the central issue in the association of discovery and risk. For the view that Jesus wished to suggest a variety of different 'finders', see Derrett, *Law*, 14; also Jacobson, *Exposition*, 272ff.

282 Schippers, *Pearl*, 236ff.

283 See Jüngel, *Paulus*, 143: "Der Fund hat sie dem Finder abgenommen." For the positive aspect to both parables, see Dupont, *Trésor*, 417ff, although the cost (or 'isk') sounds the warning note.

284 Schrage, *Thomas-Evangeliums*, 155f.

285 Schippers, *Pearl*, 237 n.3.

286 Based on the facsimile text in Guillaumont, *Nag Hammadi*, ad loc. See also Fieger, *Thomas*, 209ff.

handling goods and discovered among them a pearl'. His shrewdness consisted in the goods he handled and his ability to assess their potential. He was clever enough to work with what was providentially there, to dispose of the poorer quality and hold on to the best for himself. Once again, if that is a correct interpretation (and it fits interestingly with Logion 77), the Thomas parable sits uneasily with the overall pattern of the Gospel of Thomas (particularly the second half of Logion 76) and may well be an earlier tradition. If so, the earlier tradition could well have praised financial shrewdness in relation to the Kingdom. The surprise element is lessened; the role of providence and the financier increased.

That is however only one possible reading of the text and the value of the Thomas tradition for the history of this parable should not be overestimated. The introduction to the second half of the Logion leaves no doubt that the Gospel of Thomas saw the parable as an invitation to a search for one's own treasure, a factor not explicitly stated in the Thomas parable itself. Furthermore the text of the second half of the Logion is dependent on Mt 6:19-20/Lk 12:33, and it is the association of the two halves of the Logion that has fundamentally altered the reading of any earlier pre-Thomas tradition.

The Matthean version recalls the Q saying about the providence of God in Mt 7:7/Lk 11:9; God promises that the one who seeks will find. A merchant in his search for fine pearls is eventually rewarded: the seeker finds. Much depends here on the reading ἕνα πολύτιμον,[287] which involves an additional idea: the merchant is rewarded by discovering the finest. If this is correct, both the Matthean and the Thomas version allow that opportunity comes by providence; but with that opportunity comes the responsibility to respond.

---

[287] Both words are much discussed : 1) ἕνα because of Jeremias's claim that Thomas is a better rendering of an original Aramaic חד than Matthew's ἕνα. But see Sheppard, *Thomas*, 302. Jeremias, *Parables*, 210 (also Turner, *Grammar*, III 195f), is mistaken in his assessment of חד in relation to Matthew's ἕνα (see Jones, *Matthew 18*, 137-143): (i) the suggestion that εἷς may imply Semitic influence when used as an Indefinite Article in post-position is unwise, since such a usage is frequent in Josephus, and the outline of usage is similar in Josephus, the LXX and Matthew (see p.218 n.153); (ii) in relation to εἷς there is a greater interchange of usage between Matthew and Mark than Jeremias and Turner allow; their generalizations regarding εἷς as an Indefinite Article with the Genitive construction are inaccurate; (iii) Matthew belongs in a literary context where εἷς could be taken to mean 'a certain', 'one' or 'a'. 2) πολύτιμον because Goulder, *Midrash*, 373, regards the Adjective as characteristic of Matthew. The issues concern the text of 26:7, where βαρυτίμου is the more difficult reading, although the matter is finely balanced. The source of the word could be traditional, as illustrated in the fables: see Babrius, 57:8: πολύτιμον ἁρπάζοντες ἐμπόρου φόρτον; also Hagner, *Matthew*, I 397, on Wis 7:7-9.

(iii) *The Tradition*

The earliest teaching of Jesus has been described as consisting in radical abandonment of possessions; it provided a pattern by which wandering preachers lived.[288] It has however to be recalled that rabbinic tradition expressed itself in similar ways, without that involving that specific style of life. That is true of one of the rabbinic 'pearl' parables, bSab 119a, where the question of hyperbole is not easily resolved. On the whole, the rabbinic pearl stories have a different pattern.[289] Flusser distinguishes their presentation of God's love to Israel from the 'imperatival' quality of the Matthean parable. The Matthean variations on rabbinic usage focus specifically on the final feature of the Matthean parable: 'he sold all he had.'[290] The main theme of God's covenant love, common to rabbinic parables and the Jesus tradition, had been re-minted[291] in relation to the Kingdom, and its cost expressed in terms of daily life, this latter being an interest shared, according to Flusser, by Jesus and the classical tradition of parables. The post-Matthean traditions about the 'pearl' include particularly the Gnostic uses of the picture in relation to the true divine self, and these may well rest on Jewish-Christian traditions.[292]

(iv–v) *The History of the Parables and the History of Redaction*

As we have seen, double parables may have some antiquity, but it is not possible to demonstrate that *The Treasure* and *The Pearl* originated together and what form, if any, they had before their Greek stage. Attempts to indicate their Aramaic or Hebrew background have been unhelpful.[293] Their use by Matthew is clear, but by no means simple. Just as Matthew used the narrative parables in an extended form, so also he used parables in which metaphor could reinforce the immediate concerns of the context, and their aphoristic-like character could stimulate a fresh personal and corporate response.

If the question is raised why Matthew included the doublet of *The Treasure* and *The Pearl* in the second half of the Chapter of Parables and not in the first half, then several answers are possible. The existence of an earlier compilation of parables has been suggested. It leaves the question open as to how Matthew saw these parables as part of special teaching. Why should they be given to the disciples in private rather to the crowds in public? One

---

288 Theissen, *Wanderradikalismus*, 245.

289 Flusser, *Gleichnisse*, 130ff; e.g. Mek Ex (Tract Besh) 14.5 (Lauterbach 1.198 lines 149-155).

290 Flusser, *Gleichnisse*, 132.

291 Flusser, *Gleichnisse*, 136.

292 Davies, *Matthew*, II 439.

293 See Fieger, *Thomas*, 219ff.

possibility is that they both emphasize the cost of discipleship. The Kingdom can mean 'selling all you have'. There are echoes in Matthew of an ascetic tradition (see also 6:19–7:6) and the Matthean redactor is concerned to give them space.

I. *The Net* Mt 13:47-50

(i) *The Context*

This final parable of the three concludes the Matthean appendix of parabolic material. It belongs with the Interpretation of *The Tares*, sharing much of the latter's[294] conclusion, and using vocabulary which is sometimes better suited to the latter than to *The Net*.[295] Goulder suggests a connection between the imagery of the sea here and the opening of the chapter 'by the sea',[296] but an association of *The Net* with the other two parables in a triplet would provide a better explanation of the presence of *The Net* at this point, without of course excluding the additional reference which Goulder suggests. Weder notes that not only is *The Net* in GThom 8 similar in structure to its counterpart in Matthew, it also has links with *The Treasure* and *The Pearl*,[297] without any proof of a dependence on Matthew's Gospel.[298]

(ii) *The Redaction*

The Matthean form of the parable concerns the Last Judgment, and the separation of good and bad,[299] with the fate of the bad as the main focus. In this respect the link with the two previous parables is interesting, since according to them too, poor-quality material is dispensable. This concentration on the fate of the bad gives to the end of the parabolic material the warning character which was found at the transformed ending of the parable of *The Sower*. The danger of failure is very great. The difference in

---

[294] Kingsbury, *Parables*, 117ff; Catchpole, *Tares*, 558ff; Flusser, *Gleichnisse*, 63.

[295] Weder, *Gleichnisse*, 143 n.231.

[296] Goulder, *Midrash*, 373.

[297] Weder, *Gleichnisse*, 143ff.

[298] Quispel, *Tradition*, 112-116, suggests that behind GThom 8 is a Jewish-Christian source identifiable from Philoxenus's 6th-century version of the parable and Clement of Alexandria's deviant quotations. See also Fieger, *Thomas*, 44ff; Morrice, *Dragnet*, 269ff.

[299] Grundmann, *Matthäus*, 355; Hill, *Matthew*, 239; Fenton, *Parables*, 178ff.

the case of *The Net* is that the warning of this danger is now being presented with the Last Judgment in the foreground.[300]

There are two phrases in the parable which need particular care.

1) ἐκ παντὸς γένους συναγαγούσῃ.

The chiastic position of the Participle is probably traditional[301] and has a studied character resulting in part from the omission of the word 'fish'. This phrase could well have been added in a pre-Matthean (probably Greek)[302] stage to balance an original σαγήνῃ βληθείσῃ εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν. Matthew's uses of συνάγω in contexts of the Gentile mission[303] would not have escaped the hearer's attention, but whether the redactor introduced the Verb here is a different question. If the arguments regarding the origin of *The Tares* and its Interpretation are correct, a reference here to a universal judgment is unnecessary. The words were added as a balancing phrase to indicate the strange mixture of good and bad which obtains in the present, and the division between them which will take place in the future.

2) ἦν ὅτε ἐπληρώθη.

This is an awkwardly phrased opening, with a construction parallel to that of the two previous parables, although in the two previous parables the temporal clause was absent. It would seem possible that the temporal clause was a later addition. If the temporal clause has a double entendre,[304] it could have been added at the same stage as the balancing phrase in 13:47, with the purpose of interpreting a section of the parable otherwise without interpretation. The result is bizarre. The idea expressed in ἦν ὅτε ἐπληρώθη could easily have been rendered by a Participle but the time for the bringing in of the nets is important. Hence the addition. There are two scenes: first the fishing, then the bringing in of the nets.

It appears then that the redaction was limited in this parable to the using of an existing parable, already heavily interpreted, to serve with the material before it and, within a fresh context, as a warning that rejection would be a fearsome prospect. Nevertheless the redactor himself provided further qualifications to the content of this parable, some of which have already been noted. The conclusion of the chapter of parables was not intended by him to be the end of the matter.

---

300 Kingsbury, *Matthew 13*, 121; Cope, *Matthew*, 24; Wuellner, *Fishers of Men*.

301 See pp.291-292.

302 Weder, *Gleichnisse*, 14 n.230.

303 p.476.

304 Kingsbury, *Parables*, 121.

(iii) *The Tradition*

The outline of a parable, like *The Treasure* and *The Pearl*, has begun to emerge. Those who include v48 in the parable have found themselves in considerable difficulties with the result. The parable appears to 'draw in' only to 'reject'.[305] Those who restrict the parable to v47 are left with a parable which says virtually nothing.[306] A middle possible is suggested by Kümmel,[307] who regards the earlier parable as warning the hearers; as John the Baptist warned, the Final Judgment is a critically serious matter.

This would give the following stages in the development of the parable:

1) A very early form in which the imagery of the net is used, possibly with the implications found in the logion[308] Mt 4:18-19.

2) The development of the imagery of the net by means of popular narrative features, perhaps the picture of little fish slipping through the net back into the water and the one fine fish remaining. In the synoptic tradition this level would have led to an association with *Treasure*, *Pearl* and *Fish* at Stage 3, and also to separate traditions such as in Thomas and Clement of Alexandria (Stage 6).[309]

3) The linking of this with the doublet Mt 13:44-5, so that the three became approximately parallel[310] in structure. This extended the motif of large and small fish to the selection of fish, the throwing out of some and the storing of the best. This would be the stage also at which the Greek additions were made, highlighting the inescapable character of the judgment and the moment of the 'ingathering'. The setting of this would be the same traditional setting assumed for some of the other Q material in Matthew 13, where the teaching of Jesus and the teaching of the Baptist were presented as final warnings of the Last Judgment. (See Stage 2 of *The Tares*.)

4) The Final Judgment element was developed, using the 'Vision Interpretation' technique of the Interpretation of *The Tares*. This filled out the body of the parable and gave it a new conclusion, which at this stage warns against any attempt to separate out the faithful from the unfaithful before the end. (See Stage 5 of *The Tares*.)

5) The acceptance by Matthew of a body of material to which the redactor was not wholly committed theologically, but which Matthew chose to incorporate into a larger and, for him, more satisfactory whole.

---

305 Manson, *Sayings*, 197.

306 See also Goulder, *Midrash*, 374.

307 Kümmel, *Promise*, 138.

308 Morrice, *Dragnet*, claims too much in his search for an authentic form of the parable. In view of the possible stages in the development of the parable, some of his suggestions may point to stages in its growth other than the first.

309 Scott, *Parable*, 313.

310 Luz, *Matthäus*, 2 356f.

6) A gnostic version based on Stage 2 but shaping the parable as a parable of *The Fisherman* rather than as *The Net*.

(iv–v) *The History of the Parables and the History of Redaction*
This parable has a history like no other parable so far treated. Once again it is a unique form, created by the pressures of different settings and different literary hands or oral traditions. Its history is different. Because at Stage 3 (above) the setting included the 'interpretative' system which created *The Tares* and its Interpretation, the parable grew in an unusual way. It was extended both by the addition of the interpretative ending and by the somewhat awkward development of the picture part of the parable itself.

This is the last of sequence of parables before Jesus asks the question συνήκατε ταῦτα πάντα; Why did Matthew leave *The Net* in the position directly before the crucial question? Again there are several possible answers. Some suggest that the disciples in the second half of the chapter represent the true Israel and *The Net* symbolizes the presence of the Gentiles within that new people. That is a response which meets the distinctive features of 13:47, but not the distinctiveness of the final verses, 13:48-50. The Gentile theme cannot be ruled out entirely as a motive for the positioning of *The Net*; it would have been of great interest to the Matthean redactor and to some of his hearers. Another complementary explanation is the emphasis which *The Net* gives to the danger of ultimate failure. Perhaps the sequence of parables was important for some Christian for whom the redactor provided his Gospel; they held the theme of judgment as preached by John the Baptist and by Jesus as a central confession of faith.

Conclusion to the Chapter of Parables
What kind of unity is there in the Parable Discourse? There is a flow of material. The flow of the material from 11:1 to 13:52 carries the motif of 'hearing and seeing', the victory of the Son and the contrast between privilege and possible failure, to the point where the parable of *The Householder* gives the material a symbolic focus in the phrase καινὰ καὶ παλαιά. The function of the parables is to be understood within that flow.

CHAPTER SIX

PARABLES AND MARCAN CONTEXTS

In addition to the Marcan parables treated in the previous chapter, and those included in the eschatological discourse, there are four sections in Matthew's Gospel which embody parables from Marcan contexts: the opening of the Sermon on the Mount, chs. 9 and 15, and the chapters surrounding the parable of *The Tenants*.

A. *Salt and Light* Mt 5:13-16

(i) *The Context*

This first parabolic saying appears in both Mark and Q. Its Matthean context in Matthew is the Sermon on the Mount, for which the saying provides a summary headline. The structure of the Sermon on the Mount[1] appears to be as follows: the Beatitudes set out the qualities, privileges and suffering of those who fulfil the divine will (5:1-12);[2] these latter glorify God in the world (5:13-16)[3] through a righteousness greater than any known before, because it is based on the teaching of Jesus Christ (5:17-20).[4] From the beginning (5:13b) failure is seen to be possible. Christ however calls for a perfection, a perfection through the providence of God which is greater than that made possible by Moses (5:21-5:48),[5] in both moral and cultic matters.[6] Christ promises a reward for those whose life and worship express a humble confidence in God (Mt 6:1-34);[7] they are to be concerned with the Kingdom and the righteousness which consists in doing the Father's will (7:1-26).[8] 5:13-16 occupies a key position in that structure. It gathers up the significance of the Beatitudes and announces that in their fulfilment God is

---

1 Kissinger, *Sermon*; Hagner, *Matthew*, I 98.

2 Przybylski, *Righteousness*, 96-115; Bühl, *Demut*, 217-223.

3 Viviano, *Worship*, 217-223.

4 Ogawa, *L'histoire*, ch. 4; Sigal, *Halakah*, 192.

5 Wrege, *Überlieferung*, 57ff; Piper, *Love your Enemies*, 142-152; major questions have been raised against Meier, *Law and History*, ch. 3.

6 Jeremias, *Lass allda*, 270-275; Davies, *Sermon*, 93ff; Marguerat, *Matthieu*, 142-167.

7 Viviano, *Worship*, 99ff; Riesenfeld, *Paränese*, 47ff.

8 Luz, *Matthew*, I 407ff.

glorified[9] throughout the world.[10] Together the Beatitudes and 5:13-16 provide an opening for the first discourse and balance the conclusion of the last discourse; they correspond to the declaration at the Last Judgment of the standard of judgment for all the world (Mt 25:31-46).[11]

(ii) *The Redaction*

The phrases τὸ ἅλας τῆς γῆς,[12] τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου[13] (Mt 5:13,14; see also 5:16) correspond to the universal vision of 25:31-46. Mt 5:13-14 is probably a Matthean formulation; the doublet 'You are the salt...You are the light' in Mt 5:13-14 depends on the Genitives[14] for the distinctive character of its predicative form (contrast Lk 14:34f and Mk 9:50): "You are salt before the world; you are light before the world." They are a Matthean construction, providing a significant structural feature for chs. 5-25.

1) You are salt...

The salt metaphor strengthens this structural feature.The reference to salt in Mt 5:13 develops the Mark and Q 'salt' traditions. Mark has a question–

---

[9] Schlatter, *Matthäus*, 150f.

[10] Davies, *Sermon*, 249ff.

[11] Carlston, *Triple Tradition*, ch. 2; Theissen, *Soziologie*, 176-179.

[12] Schulz, *Q*, 470; Souček, *Salz*, 174.

[13] γῆ Schenk, *Sprache*, 110; Gundry, *Matthew*, 642; Neirynck, *Vocabulary*, 226; Bergemann, *Prüfstand*, 89-90.

Mt 43x: 20x No Par; 10x Par Mk; 4x Par Lk; 5x Diff Lk; 2x No Par or Diff Lk; 2x No Par or Diff Mk

Mk 19x: 10x Par Mt; 3x Diff Mt; 1x >*; 5x >

Lk 25x: 13x No Par; 5x Par Mk; 4x Par Mt; 2x Diff Mt; 1x Diff Mk

Mt 43x can be broken down into areas of meaning:

1) Opposite to sea=land:	2x Par Mk
2) Ground=soil:	4x Par Mk
3) Ground=beneath our feet	1x Par Mk; 2x No Par; 2x Diff Lk
4) Land=geographical or tribal area	6x No Par; 1x No Par or Diff Mk; 1x Diff Lk
5) Earth=natural, physical world	1x No Par (27:51)
6) Earth=place of change and decay	1x No Par (6:19); 1x Par Mk (27:45)
7) Earth=opposite to heaven above	8x No Par; 2x Par Mk; 2x Par Lk; 1x No Par or Diff Lk
8) Earth=inhabited earth	2x No Par or Diff Lk (5:5,13); 2x Par Lk (10:34; 12:42); 1x No Par (17:25); 1x No Par; Diff Mk (24:30)
9) Earth=with mythical associations	1x Diff Lk

[14] The Genitives are probably to be read in the context of vv13c and 16: ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων. See Davies, *Sermon*, 249-251; for alternatives, see Goulder, *Midrash*, 255; Schwarz, *Emendation*, 80ff.

Imperative form.[15] The Q saying has a question–statement form. In Matthew it stands as a parallel saying to Lk 14:34f, where it belongs to the context of costly discipleship, a theme associated elsewhere with 'salt',[16] not least where there is persecution (see Mt 5:11f).[17] The Marcan saying[18] in Mk 9:49[19] provides a related word field for Mt 5:13:[20] ἁλισθήσεται appears to refer to purification (Ezek 16:4), perhaps by persecution. The parallel in Lk 14:34 reads ἀρτυθήσεται, of the tastefulness of food. This leads in the question-half in both Q and Mk to a warning against failure: if the salt loses its taste, what will you use for seasoning?[21] Whether this question-half can be traced to an original Aramaic form is doubtful.[22] A further word field is provided in Matthew and Luke by the use of the Verb μωρανθῇ. The Wisdom associations of μωρανθῇ[23] made ἁλισθήσεται particularly attractive to Matthew; it refers to 'folly', and builds the neat contrast of 'folly'–'good sense'[24] (see 7:24-27; and Col 4:6).[25] As in the case of the summary parables, the metaphor builds the saying into the Gospel's structure.

2) You are light...

The reference to 'light' is extended by the logion of *Fetching the lamp*; this appears in both Mark and Q (Mk 4:21; Lk 8:16).[26] Matthew accepts the Q form and rejects the Marcan, leaving it out altogether in the context of the Mk 4 material.[27] Matthew adds two further logia: the logion *The City on the Hill*[28] (see POxy 1.37-42, GThom 32,[29] and the related vocabulary in

---

[15] Schulz, *Q*, 470-471; on the Marcan imperatival form, see Ogden, *Proverb*; also Bultmann, *Geschichte*, 102; Carlston, *Proverb*, 99; Klauck, *Allegorie*, 280ff; Hutton, *Salt*, 166f; Wrege, *Überlieferung*, 29.

[16] Marshall, *Luke*, 591-597; Dupont, *Renoncer*, 561ff; Goulder, *Midrash*, 255.

[17] Cullmann, *Que signifie*, 36f; *Salz*, 195f.

[18] Mk 9:50 needs to be understood in the light of the four consecutive 'Tob' proverbs in 9:42-47.

[19] Souček, *Salz*, 170ff.

[20] Hooker, *Mark*, 233; Goulder, *Midrash*, 282; Marshall, *Luke*, 595f.

[21] Wrege, *Überlieferung*, 28; Klauck, *Allegorie*, 286.

[22] For a positive judgment, see Davies, *Matthew*, I 474.

[23] For the Verb, see Ecclus 23:14 LXX; Job 38:36 (Sym); Luz, *Matthew*, I 250.

[24] Hill, *Matthew*, 115.

[25] Hauck, *TDNT* 1.228f.

[26] Klauck, *Allegorie*, 227-235.

[27] Schulz, *Q*, 474f; Wrege, *Überlieferung*, 32, for the view that the three Synoptic Gospel traditions come from independent traditions.

[28] von Rad, *City*; Campbell, *Jerusalem*; Davies, *Matthew*, I 475.

[29] Schrage, *Thomas-Evangeliums*, 8ff; Fieger, *Thomas*, 118-120, who suggests dependence of GThom 32 on POxy 1:15-20 (an older version of the saying), on Mt 5:14 and 7:24f.

Mk 4:22), and the logion *Good works* (which are seen by all, see Lk 11:33c and GThom 33).[30] Of these, *The city on the hill* logion may well have been introduced by the editor,[31] but the final logion, 5:16, could be pre-Matthean Sermon material,[32] its catechetical emphasis on God's glory[33] being a feature of the Sermon on the Mount.

The grouping of the logia in the form of a picture-doublet, 'You are salt...You are light', probably represents a deliberate attempt by the editor to give an initial focus to the Sermon on the Mount by giving it a headline-summary. In that focus, ethics and worship are given a universal context.

---

[30] Przybylski, *Righteousness*, 87-91.

[31] The linguistic evidence is confusing:

ἐπάνω Schenk, *Sprache*, 242; Gundry, *Matthew*, 644.
Mt 8x: 5x No Par; 3x Diff Mk
Mk 1x: 1x >*. For the different sense, see Senior, *Passion*, 281 n.2.
Lk 5x: 1x No Par; 3x Diff Mt; 1x Diff Mk

δύναμαι Schenk, *Sprache*, 201; Gundry, *Matthew*, 643; Neirynck, *Vocabulary*, 235; Bergemann, *Prüfstand*, 194.
Mt 27x: 8x No Par; 9x Par Mk; 2x Diff Mk; 4x Par Lk; 4x Diff Lk
Mk 33x: 9x Par Mt; 1x Diff Mt; 7x >*; 16x >
Lk 26x: 12x No Par; 4x Par Mk; 4x Par Mt; 3x Diff Mt; 1x Diff Mk; 1x >*Mt; 1x Text?

κεῖμαι Schenk, *Sprache*, 320; Gundry, *Matthew*, 645; Neirynck, *Vocabulary*, 270.
Mt 3x: 1x No Par; 1x Par Lk; 1x Diff Mk
Lk 6x: 5x No Par; 1x Par Mt

ὄρος Schenk, *Sprache*, 375; Gundry, *Matthew*, 646; Neirynck, *Vocabulary*, 294.
Mt 16x: 4x No Par; 8x Par Mk; 1x Diff Mk; 3x Diff Lk; [On 1x Diff Mk, see Mk 3:13 >*Mt]
Mk 11x: 8x Par Mt; 2x >*; 1x >
Lk 12x: 5x No Par; 7x Par Mk

The connection between 5:14a and 14b depends on the second-person form of Mt 5:14a, which may well be editorial (Goulder, *Midrash*, 254). The 'City' logion may well have been adjusted to this context, as also the negative opening of 5:14c. Donaldson, *Mountain*, notes that the ὄρος-uses in Matthew are mainly based on pre-Matthean material, but he argues that the use of that material by the final editor is distinctive and motivic. Unfortunately his argument is weakened by a failure to consider the negative evidence. Is it possible for Matthew to have been providing a Christological reinterpretation of Zion eschatology and not to have included an ὄρος reference in 25:31ff? If Zion eschatology possessed the symbolic importance Donaldson claims, then 25:31f, the final enthronement of the Son of Man, would surely be the one place to add ὄρος.

On κρύπτω, see p.346 n.248.

[32] Souček, *Salz*, 176.

[33] See 6:2 for the use of δοξάζω; 6:9 for the hallowing of the divine name; and 5:17-20 for the worship involved in study of the Law: Viviano, *Worship*, 177f.

(iii) *The Tradition*
All three metaphors—salt, light and city—have those two common areas of reference.[34] They all three can refer to ethics and worship.[35] 'Salt' reflects the function of the righteous in hallowing of the divine name;[36] 'light' refers back to Mt 4:16[37] and connects with the 'city' metaphor, as it does in the Psalms and in rabbinic literature. The elements appear together in Genesis Rabbah 59:5:

> Jerusalem is the light of the world, as it says, And nations shall walk at thy light (Is 60:3) and who is the light of Jerusalem? God, as it is written, But the Lord shall be to thee an everlasting light.[38]

The positioning of the three interlocking pictures tells us something about the redactor's awareness of metaphors. Matthew is using the interweaving of metaphors in a way which embodies a fundamental understanding of God. But Matthew is also illustrating the further development of that fundamental understanding of God which the way of Jesus has opened up. Alongside the three metaphors are the two Genitives, γῆς and κόσμου. These point to a possible new interpretation of the faith of Israel. As 4:16 has indicated, the relationship of Jew and non-Jew has been re-defined, and this involves a re-definition of God's will and God's glory (5:16). The city (5:14b) is no longer only Jerusalem; Jerusalem, it is true, remains Israel's hope for the future. But Jerusalem is also a metaphor;[39] it is a metaphor for all, Gentile and Jew, whose way of life brings glory to God. As a metaphor it brings together those areas of worship, community, celebration and responsibility which form a summary headline for the Sermon on the Mount.

(iv–v) *The History of the Parables and the History of Redaction*
This use of a summary headline marks another feature in the history of parables. The two 'You are...' statements give an advance notice of what is to follow. The adaptation of Marcan and Q material and the picture saying in 5:14b provide a motivation for obedience which anticipates the remainder of

---

[34] See p.361.

[35] On salt, see Lev 2:13; Ex 30:35; Ezek 43:21; Col 4:6. On light, see Ps 119:105; Zech 4:2. On the city, see Isa 2:2-5.

[36] Flusser, *Gleichnisse*, 256.

[37] On 4:16, see p.207.

[38] In Gen R 59:5 the pericope illustrates the divine initiative by virtue of which Abraham, Moses, David and Jerusalem are to Israel what God is to them.

[39] There is nothing new in the use of Jerusalem as metaphor (see the LXX); what is new is how the metaphor restructures the relationship of Gentile and Jew. Both constitute the people of God and belong to that people on the same terms, namely those of fulfilling the divine purpose and thus bringing glory to God.

the Sermon on the Mount (see the use of οὕτως in 5:16). Mt 5:14b in particular is a redactional structure with a special significance, both for the discourse to which it belongs and also to the five Matthean discourses as a whole: it alerts us, as in the case of the summary parables, to the structural and theological significance of metaphor in Matthew's Gospel; it points also to the special relationship of the first and the last of the discourses. The headline for the first discourse and the summary parable of the last discourse reveal the central theological emphasis of the Gospel: the re-defining of the faith of Israel as an equal partnership of Gentile and Jew.

B. *Matthew ch. 9*

(i) *The Context*

How is the Marcan parabolic material used in this section? Following the Sermon on the Mount there is[40] a group of healing narratives, either as a word–action[41] contrast or, more likely, as a complex of illustrations regarding attitudes and actions (see 12:1ff).[42] Mt 8:1-4 ends the narrative by requiring adherence to the Law[43] (although not the ceremonial Law, since Jesus touched the leper).[44] This precedes the Q Gentile healing, Mt 8:5-13,[45] leading to an Old Testament authorization for the care of the sick and the demented (8:16-17).[46] Those who heal them will, like the Son of Man, be 'loners'[47] and 'perpetual migrants'[48] (although the force of the pictures

---

[40] See Ogawa, *L'histoire*, 19.

[41] Bornkamm, *Sturmstillung*, 49; Burger, *Taten*, 272f; Thompson, *Composition*, 365ff.

[42] Sigal, *Halakah*, 147-176.

[43] Hummel, *Auseinandersetzung*, 81, taking this as evidence of an interest in the fulfilment of the purity laws. The 'command to silence' (McConnell, *Law*, 82) could refer to silence regarding the person of the healer, or silence to all but the priest. Ogawa, *L'histoire*, 135ff, notes that Matthew omits the Marcan reference to compassion and suggests that the testimony to them (Mt 8:4) is a testimony to the majesty of the Law given to Matthew's own contemporaries. There are however many Minor Agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark in this passage and one of them is the omission of 'compassion' (Mt 8:3=Lk 5:13 Diff Mk 1:41). The injunction to silence could be understood by Matthew as the maintaining of separation until the ritual act of purification has been witnessed (Lev 13:46; Neusner, *Eliezer*, I 298f).

[44] The 'compassion' consisted in the touching of the outcast, and therefore provides a qualification at this point of the ceremonial Law; see Cope, *Matthew* 68, quoting Mishnah Oholoth 8:1ff.

[45] The law of purity is not infringed here, for all that it is a Gentile healing.

[46] Vencovský, *Exorcismus*; Derrett, *Demoniac*.

[47] In the case of ἀλώπεκες the LXX use points to the translation 'jackals'; φωλεοὺς on the other hand (see Sophocles, *Lexicon*; Job 38:40 in Origen's

ἀλώπεκες/πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ is not altogether clear, at the Matthean stage in the history of tradition the words underline the discomforts of discipleship).[49] In 9:1ff Matthew reverts to the Marcan outline, using Mk 2:1-22. The narrative remains with that outline (except for Mk 6:6b,7,34) until 13:36. Within this Marcan material are the three picture sayings: the ἰατρός saying in Mt 9:12, the νυμφίος saying in 9:15, and the οἶνος saying in 9:17. The purpose of the following context, 9:18-36, is not clear, since 9:27-31 is a classic case of material where Matthew does not seem to be following our version of Mark.[50] It concerns merciful sympathy to all, including the ritually impure, and this prepares the way for the bridge reference to θερισμὸς in 9:37. The discourse on the disciples' commission follows (ch. 10).

(ii) *The Redaction*

In 9:9-13, as in 8:17, Jesus' work is authorized by an Old Testament reference. His association with sinners is based[51] on Hosea 6:6 (Mt 9:13). This is the text used in 12:7[52] as the ground for the humanitarian use of Sabbath laws: ἔλεος θέλω καὶ οὐ θυσίαν. In all the three cases where ἔλεος is used[53] the context refers to Pharisees, and implies that the latter have not fulfilled God's demand for mercy.[54] The occasion is presented as an

---

Hexapla) might suit better the vulpes flavescens (the solitary fox). But see Casey, *Jackals*, 8 and n.19, with Tristram, *Fauna*; Alon, *Fauna*.

[48] πετεινὰ is too general to allow a precise reference, such as the Griffon Vulture soaring in great colonies in northern ravines (see Job 39:28 and 11QtgJb), as is suggested sometimes. The LXX illustrates the general use (Ps 103:17, where Origen's *Hexapla* has στρουθία ἐννοσσεύσουσι, and Aquila ὄρνεα). The mass of migrating birds in April to September along the Jordan Valley, or in January roosting in the valley, provides a better alternative picture. See Casey *Jackals*, 8 and n.20. The pictures used of the Son of Man and consequently of his followers could therefore be of 'loners' and 'migrants'.

[49] Earlier stages recognized the migrant's need to break customary rules and family ties: Theissen, *Wanderradikalismus*, 245-271; Hengel, *Nachfolge*; Neusner, *Purity*, 60.

[50] Fuchs, *Untersuchungen*.

[51] Sigal, *Halakah*, 67ff, on religio-humanitarian concerns influencing the halakah; see Cope, *Matthew*, 67 on table fellowship with non-kosher persons.

[52] See Sigal, *Halakah*, 159-166. For the view that חסד refers to the inner loyalty necessary for cultic observance, see Davies, *Matthew* II, 105. For the sense that Matthew prefers חסד to sacrifice, including both within the call to obedience, see Luz, *Matthäus* 1/2, 44. Yohanan ben Zakkai seems to have argued that חסד has soteriological qualities so that violations of the Sabbath on compassionate grounds do not result in exclusion from the community of salvation.

[53] Mt 9:13; 12:7 and 23:23.

[54] Przybylski, *Righteousness*, 100f; Frankemölle, *Jahwebund*, 301-304.

exegetical debate[55] with ἔλεος at its centre. The ἰατρός saying (9:12) takes up the Jewish[56] and Hellenistic[57] metaphorical use of ἰατρός and ἰάομαι for man's total condition forgiveness),[58] and by a delicate synecdoche[59] compares the mercy of the doctor with that of Jesus.

The νυμφιός saying concerns 'fasting', which in Mt 9:15 is glossed by πενθεῖν (Mt 9:15).[60] Three possible explanations of the gloss are: 1) The saying criticizes the wrong form of fasting only (for the right kind of fasting, 'glad fasting',[61] see 6:16-18); or 2) it avoids the implication that Jesus could ever have spoken against fasting (particularly as the Lord is always with his disciples; see 28:20);[62] or 3) it concerns the inner response required by those who 'watch for the Bridegroom's coming'.[63] All these three contribute towards a satisfactory interpretation of this gloss:[64] The first sees correctly that μὴ δύναται...πενθεῖν is an attack on morose exhibitionism; the second evaluates ἐφ' ὅσον correctly as a blurring of the distinction between the time of the church and the time of Jesus;[65] the third recognizes in πενθεῖν a pointer towards an acceptable interpretation of fasting, as πενθεῖν expresses both that morose attitude which the Christian must avoid and the appropriate humility before God[66] which the Christian

---

[55] Cope, *Matthew*, 65-73.

[56] Klauck, *Allegorie*, 152.

[57] Klauck, *Allegorie*, 153.

[58] See p. 364.

[59] By synecdoche is meant here not the narrow use of 'whole for part', such as the Quintilian instances in *Institutio Oratoria* 8.6.20, but a sub-species of metaphor (see 8.6.19) in which one particular feature common to the two areas held in tension provides the dynamic power of the metaphor.

[60] πενθεῖν only in the Synoptics at Mt 5:4 No Par or Diff Lk; 9:15 Diff Mk; Mk 16:10?; Lk 6:25 No Par. For a different view, see Schenk, *Sprache*, 52.

[61] Hill, *Matthew*, 141, for anointing as a symbol of joy; 176 '...the issue was not one about fasting itself, but about fasting as an expression of sadness and affliction'.

[62] Cope, *Matthew*, 68.

[63] On the textual issue, see *TDNT*, 6.42 n.16; this note is the basis for the exegesis of a number of scholars. Strecker, *Gerechtigkeit*, 189-190; Klauck, *Allegorie*, 167.

[64] Included within the general problem of fasting could be the particular issues of halakah on Sabbath fasting: Sigal, *Halakah*, 161.

[65] Ogawa, *L'histoire*, 283. ἐφ' ὅσον Mt 2x No Par; 2x Diff Mk (temporal).
ὅσος
Mt 15x: 9x No Par; 3x Par Mk; 1x Diff Mk; 1x Diff Lk; 1x Diff Lk or No Par
Mk 14x: 3x Par Mt; 1x Diff Mt; 1x >*; 1x > Mt; 6x >
Lk 10x: 3x No Par; 4x Par Mk; 1x Diff Mt; 2x No Par or Diff Mk

[66] ταπεινός, ταπεινόω, ταπείνωσις Schenk, *Sprache*, 440; Jones, *Matthew 18*, 372-417. In biblical writings the Adjective and the Verb are used in proverbial contexts where the Wisdom inversion of human practice is considered. Both Old and New use the term in contexts promising a change of

should practise and which, in its outward aspects, fasting should symbolize (Mt 5:4).

The οἶνος pericope confirms this interpretation of fasting. ἀμφότεροι συντηροῦνται (Mt 9:17d Diff Mk and Lk) may be understood generally as urging the retention of old customs providing that they are given a new form (see Mt 13:52); or, it may be understood specifically of fasting, as implying that both its form and the attitude it symbolizes must be new.[67] The form must have no show of moroseness; the spirit must bring together the distinctive attitudes of humility and joy (Mt 5:12; 25:21,23). To retain the old style of fasting along with this inner attitude would be an attempt to comprehend in Christian practice incompatible elements (τὸ κουνὸν καὶ τοῦ παλαιοῦ in Mk 2:21 is absent from Mt 9:16, but Mt 9:17 retains the reference to incompatible elements).[68]

In these three cases the traditional metaphors have been adapted by Matthew, the first, ἰατρός, the more effectively because of the natural

---

circumstances, and both use them in relation to that 'humility' which is humanity's proper attitude to God. The Adjective has complex associations relating: 1) to God's justice, benevolence and salvation of the destitute and helpless, particularly in the Old Testament Psalms of Lament and Thanksgiving, 2) to his requirement of justice from those insensible to need, and 3) to the integrity of those who seek God's commands. In some of these respects the Adjective ταπεινός overlaps with πραΰς (see Prov 16:18f; Ps Sol 2:26). The Verb includes contexts relating to penitence, fasting and mortification, as well as many of the Wisdom and Psalm associations found in the uses of the Verb. A comparison of these findings with the use of these words in the Greek and Hellenistic world reveals the distinctiveness of the Wisdom and Psalm associations of these terms. This fits with Grundmann, *TDNT*, 8.1ff. The exception however is the popular fable literature, where the secular usage approximates to key features of the biblical: see Babrius, 45:16; 112:10.

[67] Klauck, *Allegorie*, 169ff; on the interest of both Mark and Matthew in retaining the old and the new, see Kee, *Wine*, 18; Muddiman, *Fasting*, 271ff; Hooker, *Continuity*, 21-27; on the Lucan interest expressed through 5:39, see Dupont, *Vin*, 302ff; for the possibility that a two-line saying stands behind the tradition, see Nagel, *Wein*, 6-7; for a discussion of the original form of the sayings and their relationship to GThom 47, see Hahn, *Wein*, 357-375, who regards the sayings as originally concerned with the new power of the Kingdom, inimical to the old order, and the context of fasting as secondary (see also Fieger, *Thomas*, 153).

[68] The main problem here is the degree of specificity or generalization in the interpretation of Mt 9:14-17. Are the two pictures to be understood as a reference to fasting only? Or are they to be understood with reference to fasting within a more general acceptance of what is 'old and new'? The intermediate position (Klauck, *Allegorie*, 173), that 9:17c brings together the Old Testament and its fulfilment, is less acceptable than either of the extremes. In all probability Matthew's tradition understood the verse specifically of fasting, whereas in the context of the whole Gospel 9:17c can take on the resonances of 13:52.

overlap of associations between Matthew's new context and the traditional imagery.

(iii) *The Tradition*

The Marcan tradition in 2:1ff is organized around two poles: the opposition of the Jewish authorities which eventually brings about their own destruction, and the new life which results from the work of Jesus.[69] In Matthew this tradition is reshaped. Its outline is retained, but without the overall motivation which inspired it in Mark.[70] The result is a lack of clarity in the Matthean version, directly attributable to the treatment of Mark as tradition.[71]

Unclear is also the historical background of Matthew ch. 9. The text describes it as an exegetical debate involving Pharisees and expounds its central concern as 'mercy and not sacrifice'. This was a theme espoused by Yohanan ben Zakkai,[72] and the humanitarian form of exegesis it implies was current among early rabbis.[73] Within the arguments which followed the fall of Jerusalem in 70 CE it is difficult to limit this particular emphasis to any particular group.[74] The background to ch. 9 may well be a complex pattern of reactions drawn from different groups and even from different generations.

(iv–v) *The History of the Parables and the History of Redaction*

The treatment of figurative language as tradition is often evidence of its adaptability. This is true here, but only in part. The result is, on the one hand, as we have seen, a clever piece of synecdoche; on the other hand ch. 9 is an opaque piece of writing. Matthew's use of Hos 6:6 provides a redactional key; it is also Matthew's hermeneutical key to understanding Christ's teaching as well as Gospel's approach to the Gentiles.[75]

C. *Matthew ch. 15*

(i) *The Context*

Matthew is moving along a Marcan route. The Gospel has presented John the Baptist's death as a paradigm of the fate of the righteous[76] (14:1-12), and

---

69 Dewey, *Debate*.
70 On the context provided by Matthew, see Ogawa, *L'histoire*, 19.
71 See the problem indicated in n.68 above.
72 Neusner, *Yohanan*.
73 Sigal, *Halakah*, 167ff.
74 See however Neusner, *Eliezer*, 302-331.
75 Wong, *Interkulturelle*, 78f.
76 Murphy-O'Connor, *Structure*, 360-384; Bonnard, *Matthieu*, 217.

the feeding (and teaching) of the multitude as marks of the merciful revelation of God's ways (14:13-21).[77] Peter's deliverance is presented in the same light (14:22-33).[78] The next Marcan section, Mk 7:1-23, leads Matthew into a major discussion of tradition (Mt 15:1-20) and embedded in that discussion is an isolated use of παραβολή (15:15). The word here refers to a saying requiring explanation (a kind of puzzle):[79]

οὐ τὸ εἰσερχόμενον εἰς τὸ στόμα κοινοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐκπορευόμενον ἐκ τοῦ στόματος τοῦτο κοινοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον.

The puzzle is explained in vv17f; the first part of the saying refers to the digestive system, and the second part to what comes ἐκ τῆς καρδίας. It is the second, not the first, which contaminates. The passage concludes with references to the merciful work of Jesus (Mt 15:21ff Par Mk 7:24ff) in his ministry to Gentiles and to sick and hungry crowds.[80]

(ii) *The Tradition*

Matthew's version lacks any reference to the cleansing of all foods.[81] The Gospel also makes clear that the issue of eating with unwashed hands (15:12,20 Diff Mk) is overshadowed by other issues, such as that which passes the lips (15:8 uses Isa 29:13,[82] with its sharp distinction between the mouth and the heart). These 'other things' are listed as follows: διαλογισμοί, πονηροί, φόνοι, μοιχεῖαι, πορνεῖαι, κλοπαί, ψευδομαρτυρίαι, βλασφημίαι. These all belong[83] to the παράδοσις by which the Pharisees and scribes (15:1) interpret Scripture. In particular it is the means by which they interpret what Mark calls the commandment of

[77] As a summary statement this is preferable to Nolan, *Son*, 179.

[78] Hill, *Son and Servant*, 4-5.

[79] Klauck, *Allegorie*, 272.

[80] Trilling, *Wahre Israel*, 82-84.

[81] Contrast 7:19; see Hooker, *Mark*, 179.

[82] Carlston, *Law*, 75ff; Neusner, *Cleanse the Inside*, 486-495; on the significance of Isa 29:13, see Booth, *Purity*, 39-40, 91-93, and in this context Cope, *Matthew*, 60-61, who argues that the quotation weights the list of sins toward the verbal. This is not altogether convincing; see Klauck, *Allegorie*. It is true that pride of place is given to διαλογισμοί (Diff Mk), but three verbal sins in Mark are omitted by Matthew. The association of μοιχεῖαι with πορνεῖαι in 15:19 might suggest that πορνεία refers to incestuous relationships (Mueller, *Divorce*, 255f) but the wider sense of 'wanton behaviour' is more likely (Jensen, *Porneia*, 180 n.49)

[83] This seems to be the most satisfactory solution; it does not however imply that the list represents Matthew's own selection.

Moses, but what Matthew unequivocally calls 'God's commandment' (15:4).[84]

Between the παραβολή and its Interpretation is placed a Q saying (Mt 15:14/Lk 6:39),[85] which is designated παραβολή in Luke,[86] and which was probably used proverbially of the Jewish leaders.[87] It is introduced by a piece of anti-Pharisaic polemic:[88] the Matthean section is a sharply focussed polemic against Pharisaic traditions of interpretation, and it is implied that these traditions are a cause of blasphemy, murder, robbery and impurity.[89]

(iii) *The Redaction*

It has been argued that Mk 7:11 and 15 represent a Marcan parallel to what is said about parables in Mk 4. The word παραβολή has been introduced as a preface to a traditional catalogue of sins, making the list an interpretation, parallel to the Interpretation of *The Sower* in 4:14-20. The catalogue in Mark serves to emphasize the need for purity of heart and motive.[90] If this is correct, the contrast in the case of Matthew is illuminating. First, although Matthew's Gospel restricts the interpretation to one part of the pericope, providing further evidence for an approach to parables parallel to that in ch. 13,[91] Mt 15 is a piece of polemic and must be treated alongside ch. 9, raising the question once again of the circumstances in which such a polemic against the Pharisees was likely.[92] Second, it is strange, particularly in view of Mt 18:35, that Matthew should alter the catalogue of sins so that they no longer refer to sins of the heart but refer instead to the Pharisaic interpretation of the Law. There is a probable inference: the pre-Matthean traditional element in Mt 15:1ff was probably strong.

(iv–v) *The History of the Parables and the History of Redaction*

It is apparent that the history of the interpretation of parables must include interpretations where the level of the saying (here 'the mouth') is closely

---

[84] See Davies, *Matthew*, II 522-523.

[85] Catchpole, *Q*, 80.

[86] Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium*, I 366-372

[87] Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium*, I 367 n.1, for the Accusative after the Verb of Saying as Lucan.

[88] Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium*, I 370.

[89] See p.153.

[90] There is material here with parallels elsewhere in Matthew's Gospel: see Cope, *Matthew*, 58. On the other hand the form of the saying corresponds to Mt 7:19 and could belong to a pre-Matthean group of sayings: Mt 7:3ff,16-21/Lk 6:42,43ff. See Mt 10:24f/Lk 6:40 and on this possibility Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium*, I 369.

[91] See pp.310-311.

[92] See p.154.

related to the level of the interpretation (here 'what the mouth says'). It is also apparent that there are tensions within the Matthean post-Marcan levels of the tradition.

D. *The Parable of the Tenants* Matthew 21:33ff.

(i) *The Context*

The immediate context of this parable in Matthew's Gospel includes the parable of *The Two Sons* (Mt 21:28-32). These two parables have much in common in content and vocabulary. They both contrast the failure of the Jewish leaders to recognize the prophetic authority of John the Baptist and of Jesus Christ with the astonishing gift of the Kingdom to those who had never expected to share in it (21:31-32,43-46 and 26-27).[93] They both include four items of vocabulary: ὕστερον, ὡσαύτως, ἀμπελών and βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.[94] A distinctive element, found in the parable of *The Tenants* in Matthew but not in *The Two Sons*, is the note of judgment in 21:44. Whether or not this verse should be read as part of the original text of Matthew must be considered later. What must be explained is why the two parables have interests in common and, if 21:44 is original, why they differ at that point.

The wider context of the parable shows Matthew dependent on the Marcan order (see Mt 21:1 and Mk 11:1, Mt 22:22 and Mk 12:17). Matthew differs from Mark in a number of respects: in his emphatic, structural use of the prophet motif, in his use of the parable of *The Two Sons*, and, in common with Luke, in his juxtaposition of the Triumphal Entry and the Cleansing of the Temple. This juxtaposition of the Triumphal Entry with the Cleansing of the Temple was probably taken over from a post-Marcan stage of the Marcan Gospel tradition.

The wider context of *The Tenants* is variously assessed. Eduard Schweizer finds in this wider context a fourfold pattern to which the section Mt 22-25 corresponds: it is a pattern which concerns the trial, declaration of guilt, pronouncement of sentence on and punishment of Jewish people. Within

---

[93] pp. 386ff. On the 'prophet' motif, see the additions to Mt 22:15 in the Egerton London Papyrus 2, and Mt 21:46 Diff Mk. On the background to Mt 21:31 in the Q tradition, especially the association of John the Baptist and Jesus as messengers of divine Wisdom, see Mt 11:7-19/Lk 7:24-35; Hoffmann, *Studien*, 320; Schulz, *Q*, 45-53. On the possibility of a common source in the form of a Baptist sequence, see Lowe, *Vineyard*, 257-263.

[94] See p.380 n.143, also p.383 n.154. Their importance lies not only in their appearance in these two parables but also in the distinctiveness of three of them in the parables. For vocabulary linking 21:28-32, 21:33-46, 22:1-14, see van Tilborg, *Jewish Leaders*, 47 n.3.

this scheme the parable of *The Tenants* declares the passing of sentence on the Jews. Such a scheme is however far too restricting and requires that Schweizer must take v45 to concern the Jews as a whole, when it appears only to concern the leaders.[95] More significant is the interpretation of the Fig-Tree pericope provided by Telford. That pericope provides a paradigm of the power available to supplicating faith, or, to use the terminology employed in the study of ch. 13, a paradigm of the privilege of faith. A major distinction between the Marcan and Matthean context here, of considerable importance for a study of the parable of *The Tenants*, is the more favourable approach to the Temple in Matthew.[96] After the Cleansing of the Temple, Jesus can heal and the children can worship there.

(ii–iii) *Redaction and Tradition*

The introduction to the parable of *The Tenants* may be pre-Matthean (see v33 ἄλλην παραβολὴν ἀκούσατε).[97] In Mark the parable has a triple division, with sections of unequal lengths. In Matthew these sections have more clearly marked openings, but the middle section remains the longest. This middle section includes, in all the three Synoptic Gospels, a triplet of 'sendings'. In Luke and Mark this triplet is complete without the sending of the owner's son, whereas in Matthew the triplet includes the sending of the son. What is true for Matthew is true also for the GThom 65, where the killing of the son completes the parable.[98] The triple division of the parable has a parallel in the outline of the Isaianic parable (Is 5:1ff). It is possible

---

[95] Schweizer, *Matthäus*, 116-125, *Matthew*, 414; Garland, *Matthew 23*, 32 n.75. But see Telford, *Barren Temple*, 74f, and the use of the Particles in Matthew 24; see p.425 n.3.

[96] Telford, *Barren Temple*, 69-84, 205ff.

[97] The introduction in Mt 21:33 links with 21:33-46 and 21:28-32 (contrast Mk 12:1-9 and Lk 20:9-16). 21:33-34 is designated by this introduction as a further parable concerning the responses to divine grace. ἄλλην παραβολὴν occurs elsewhere in Matthew, at 13:24,31 and 33. But ch. 13 contains another trio of parables not introduced by ἄλλην παραβολὴν. It is not clear that either of these trios of parables is the result of Matthean editorial composition. ἀκούσατε occurs in 21:33 and 13:18 Diff Mk, introducing the parable of *The Sower*. See its Wisdom use in Sir 30:27(33:19).

[98] The significance of the abrupt ending of the parable of *The Tenants* in the GThom is that it becomes an example story: Sheppard, *Thomas*, 184-215. For a gnostic intention behind the abrupt ending, see Dehandschutter, *Vignerons*, 203-219; Fieger, *Thomas*, 194; see also Briscoe, *Thomas*, 87. For an attempt to trace the original form of the parable here, see Morrice, *Tenants*, 105; O'Neill, *Husbandmen*, 485ff; but see Schrage, *Thomas-Evangeliums*, 144 n.20. For the possibility of a pre-Tatian harmonizing process here, see Snodgrass, *Tenants*, 142-144.

that the three Isaianic sections provide structural elements on which the synoptic versions depend.[99]

Nine questions emerge from a careful analysis of the Matthean parable:

1) In Mt 21:33 Matthew has a variant on Mark's use of the Isaianic parable. What is the motive for this variation?

In his major work on the parable of *The Tenants*, Hubaut distinguishes between two aspects of Mt 21:33. There is the 'symbolic element' in the choice of vocabulary for the vineyard, its wall, press and tower; and there is the 'gauche opening' of the verse, where Semitic colouring points to a non-Marcan, pre-Matthean source. The argument for a Semitic background can however be overstated. The word οἰκοδεσπότης, claimed by Hubaut as evidence of Semitic origin,[100] could well point to a different background;[101] and the word order at the opening of Mt 21:33,[102] far from being 'gauche', is probably a reasonably stylistic opening: 'There was once a man, a man of property, who....' Because of the LXX formula used here (τις is probably[103] a secondary reading, and ὅστις is probably the original text)[104] Mt 21:33 has a Greek narrative style.[105]

On the issue of symbolic language, the matter needs to be stated rather differently from the way in which it is presented by Hubaut.[106] Hubaut discusses each item of vocabulary and provides evidence to the effect that each word was chosen so as to highlight features of the city of Jerusalem. Almost certainly the hearer of the parable was being directed toward the conclusion that the parable concerned Jerusalem, either the actual city of

---

[99] The triple form of the LXX of Isa 5 is indicated by a threefold repetition (5:2,4,6). Within this structure the description of the making of the vineyard, the question raised by the vineyard owner and the reply provide the opening and concluding sections in each of the Synoptics. On the outline, the question form and the use of dialogue, see Klauck, *Allegorie*, 287 n.3, also 288 and 291.

[100] Hubaut, *Vignerons*, 26.

[101] See pp.202-203.

[102] The position of the Verb is worth comment. It delays the appearance of the second Noun. There are examples in Matthew of this Verb in unexpected positions: see Mt 3:4 Diff Mk/Lk; but there are no narrative parallels (see Lk 4:33 Par Mk 1:23; Mk 3:1 Par Lk 6:6; see Mt 12:10; and Mk 4:38, without parallel in Matthew or Luke). There is a similar type of sentence in Lk 2:25 (see the unexpected position of ἦν in 2:25d). The closest parallels to 21:33 are:

Lk 14:2 No Par; A narrative healing with ἰδοὺ;
Lk 16:1 No Par; A parable;
Lk 16:19 No Par; A parable.
See also Jn 3:1; 4:46; 5:1; 11:1.

[103] See Legg, *Matthew*, ad loc.

[104] See p.175 n.3.

[105] For the argument regarding Semitisms and rabbinic parallels, see Hengel, *Zenonpapyri*, 7 n. 31.

[106] Hubaut, *Vignerons*, 16ff.

Jerusalem, or the religious or power structure which Jerusalem symbolized. But that purpose did not necessarily require that the choice of each word should indicate specific parts of Jerusalem. Hubaut's theory would imply that Matthew rewrote the opening of the parable as Bunyan wrote *Pilgrim's Progress*: each key word had a precise reference point within a clearly defined religious system. The parable would in fact be what is technically known in the modern world of literary criticism, as distinct from the ancient use of the term, as an Allegory. A more systematic discussion of the vocabulary found in Mt 21:33 than that used by Hubaut leads to a different conclusion. From that standpoint Matthew's intention was not to write literary allegory. The vocabulary in Mt 21:33 has a broader base than literary allegory requires. Matthew was narrating in a metaphorical, not an allegorical, style; and the chief characteristic of that metaphorical style is an exploratory web of allusions rather than an exact series of references. In the case of φραγμός, for example, Hubaut deploys evidence for its use in relation to the Jerusalem Law (as, Hubaut suggests, in Eph 2:14f). But in fact φραγμός would have been just as appropriate in the narrative of a fable or a proverb which had nothing to do with Jerusalem. Its choice in Mark 12:1 and in Matthew 21:33 follows the LXX of Isa 5:2, where the vocabulary belongs within a distinctive pattern of viticulture. In Matthew 21:33 therefore, φραγμός is part of a web of traditional references which intensify the picture of careful construction of the vineyard and hence of the divine care exercised over Jerusalem.[107] ληνός does not have to have a metaphorical role, and even though Origen uses the word ληνός with specific reference to the Jerusalem altar,[108] its range of use in the LXX[109] and secular contexts indicates that,

[107] Hubaut, *Vignerons*, 18-21, argues that φραγμός can be identified with the Law. But φραγμός is used with varied nuances in the LXX (Pss 80:12; 89:4; Prov 24:46) and is widely used in Aesopian and Syrian fables (*Cor Fab Aesop* 233, 198; Archias, *Anth Graec* 9.343). The Eph 2:14 reference is inappropriate to Mk 12:1: see van Roon, *Ephesians*, 371 n.2; Mussner, *Das All*, 81ff.

[108] Hubaut, *Vignerons*, 22, links ληνός with the Jewish sacrificial system. See also the linguistic comments of Gundry, *Matthew*, 44. Hubaut and Gundry have not explored adequately the relevant vocabulary usage: יקב (as in Joel) can mean presses or vats; secular uses of ληνός are similarly ambiguous; see Theocritus, *Idyll*, 25.28, and on the vintage associations there, see Gow, *Commentary on Theocritus*, 446. ληνός is used of the whole system of presses and vats in Zenon Papyrus 2054 (*Zenon Archive*, 203); it is used specifically of the press in Diodorus Siculus 4.5.1, and specifically of the vat in POxy 729 (CE 137). For details of press and storage system, see Pékary, *Wirtschaft*, 86-90; Préaux, *L'économie*, 166-171; White, *Farming*, Appendices A–D.

[109] ληνός is used in the LXX as a translation for רחט (2x Genesis), גת (5x), גתית (2x in Psalm titles), יקב (9x including Joel 2:24), דמע (1x), ממגרה (1x); see also Sir 30:25(33:16). ὑπολήνιον is used for יקב 4x, and 1x in Aquila and Symmachus, particularly in Joel 4:13 of judgment and in Isa 16:10 of harvest joy.

even should a symbolic reference be preferred for it here, the Jerusalem altar is not a likely point of reference. Assonance may well have played a part in the selection of this item of vocabulary.[110] πύργος[111] has an evocative ambiguity, as also have ὤρυξεν[112] and ᾠκοδόμησεν.[113] ἀμπελών[114] could have any one of a series of referents:[115] situations of satisfaction and disappointment, of responsibility and investment, of economy, human or divine.[116] ἀμπελών could refer to any or all of them, and those associations are part of the web of allusions in Mt 21:33. Nevertheless Isa 5:1 and Mk 12:1 provide the central thread. The vineyard, like Jerusalem, has a long prior history.

The word order in the later part of Mt 21:33 suggests that there is a stylistic factor at work. This is true for the phrase φραγμὸν αὐτῷ περιέθηκεν, a most unusual phrase from the point of view of word order.

---

[110] The issue of assonance and rhythm in Mt 21:33 may have been a factor in the choice of ληνός.

[111] The general consensus is that the opening of the narrative in all the Gospels exhibits a primary realism, although the farming methods represented may differ: Pesch, *Markus-Evangelium*, I 215f; Anderson, *Mark*, 272; Hooker, *Mark*, 275.

[112] ὤρυξα is a favourite LXX form, used particularly for making wells. The only other Matthean use is Mt 25:18 Diff Lk (>*). The addition in Matthew of ἐν αὐτῷ brings the Matthean text closer to the LXX. The textual situation is complex but does not provide evidence of intrusions to an extent that would affect the Matthean authenticity of ἐν αὐτῷ.

[113] Hubaut, *Vignerons*, 21ff, takes πύργος to be a classic symbol for Zion and Jerusalem: Mic 4:8; Cant 8:10; 1 Enoch 89:50; Barnabas 16:5. The Aramaic equivalents בירתא (probably) and מגדל (certainly) in the Qumran material refer to Jerusalem, either the Old or the New (Milik, *Enoch*, 46; 4QPs Dan ar^{a-c}; 5QJNar (5Q15) frg 1, col. 1.13). But the ambiguity of the word πύργος again can be judged from the LXX: Temple, Jerusalem, idolatrous buildings, secure place, look-out, store-house and outbuildings. See Babrius, *Iamb* 9, for a vineyard fable's use of πύργος. On οἰκοδομέω, see p.175 n.3.

[114] The link between ἀμπελών and Israel needs to be carefully stated. There is the basic problem of how the parable of *The Tenants* is being told in each of the Synoptics, and at what point in *The Tenants* the link becomes explicit. There is the problem (not sensed by Hubaut, *Vignerons*, 16) of the ways in which ἀμπελών relates to Israel. According to Steck, *Israel*, 270 n.7, ἀμπελών always stands for Israel, and it is Israel as the Chosen One who is to be judged (67ff). Apart from basic problems in Steck's case (see Hoffmann, *Logienquelle*, 162ff) the linguistic case also is overstated, as the association of ἀμπελών and φυτεύω indicate (1 Esdras 4:16; Eccles 2:4; Mt 15:13; 1 Cor 9:7; and Lk 13:6).

[115] It is interesting to speculate on how Gentile Christians might have heard the parable. The different farming methods reflected in the texts and the local uses of the metaphor might well have extended the parable's reference. See the discussion of the river in spate for a parallel example: p.187 n.51.

[116] Disappointment in Isa 5, investment in Matthew, economy in Luke are hinted at by the way the story is told in each.

Nowhere in the LXX with περιτίθημι,[117] and nowhere in the Synoptics (except in three very ambiguous examples, Mt 12:46, Mk 14:67; 15:2)[118] is the pronominal Dative placed before its controlling Finite Verb, and nowhere can it be shown to be an editorial preference. The reason for its use here, as also for the choice of the vocabulary, could well be the search for assonance. There is a stylistic factor at work.

2) Mt 21:34 refers to ὁ καιρὸς τῶν καρπῶν. Does this require a salvation-historical interpretation of the parable?

Without any doubt the parable of *The Tenants* as a whole can be seen as 'salvation-history'.[119] It is a re-telling of the story of Israel. But particular elements of the parable seem to require a distinctive approach to salvation-history. Mt 21:33 and Mk 12:1 use ἀπεδήμησεν of the owner;[120] that could

---

[117] περιτίθημι Schenk, *Sprache*, 115.

Mt 3x:	3x Par Mk;		
		21:33	φραγμὸν αὐτῷ περιέθηκεν.
		27:28	περιέθηκεν αὐτῷ.
		27:48	περιθεὶς καλαμῳ.
Mk 3x:	3x Par Mt;		
		12:1	περιέθηκεν φραγμόν.
		15:17	περιτιθέασιν αὐτῷ.
		15:36	περιθεὶς καλαμῳ.
Jn 19:29			ὑσσώπῳ περιθέντες.
1 Cor 12:23	τούτοις τιμὴν περισσοτέραν περιτίθεμεν.		

In the LXX, out of 24 examples where the Dative is used with this Verb, in 17 of them the Dative follows immediately after the Verb. In no example apart from Mt 21:33 does the pronominal Dative immediately precede the Verb.

[118] In Matthew αὐτῷ appears in post-position 38x Diff Mk, 6x Diff Lk. There is one ambiguous example: Mt 12:46. In Mark αὐτῷ appears in post-position 8x Diff Mt with ἐπιτιμάω, ἐπιβάλλω, λέγω, προσέρχομαι, ἐμπτύω, ἀκολουθέω, and 15x >* (Mk 14:67 and 15:2 are ambiguous). In Luke it appears in post-position 4x Diff Mt (1x is ambiguous), and 1x >*Mt.

Except for the ambiguous cases where a Participle taking the Dative precedes the pronominal Dative and main Verb, all uses of the pronominal Dative which might exhibit editorial preferences are in post-position. Mt 21:33 is unusual.

[119] Hooker, *Mark*, 274; Wright, *People*, 218; Drury, *Parables*, 64-67.

[120] (i) The precise significance of ἀπεδήμησεν is disputed.

ἀποδημέω Schenk, *Sprache*, 37; Neirynck, *Vocabulary*, 217.

Mt 3x:	1x Par Mk; 2x Diff Lk (Mt 25:14 Diff Lk,15:15 >*Lk)
Mk 1x:	1x Par Mt
Lk 2x:	1x No Par; 1x Par Mk

In all these examples the sense seems to be 'to go on a journey'; but does it imply 'travel to a foreign country'? Josephus provides examples of both: see Jos Ant 8.339 'go on a journey'; with examples of a son being sent as deputy: Jos Ant 16.87. The noun is often linked with troubles at home during the period of absence. Philo's range of usage is more circumscribed. Hubaut, *Vignerons*, 27, finds metaphorical aspects alongside the secular usage. It expresses, he suggests, the distance between the Jews and God as well as the absence of the ruler from

of course be interpreted as a reference to the Parousia, although rabbinic parables use a comparable expression without that reference.[121] The problems appear when these elements are taken in the sequence in which they appear in the parable. They do not then fit so neatly into a retelling of Israel's story. Perhaps the most important of these special elements is ὁ καιρὸς τῶν καρπῶν. This would have a natural reference to the Final Judgment, since in Matthew, as elsewhere in the New Testament, the harvest is a picture of the Last Things. However, ὁ καιρὸς τῶν καρπῶν in Matthew occurs right at the beginning of the parable. A reference to the Final Judgment so early in the parable would provide insuperable difficulties. Hubaut attempts to meet the problem by means of an ingenious solution. He assumes that the Matthean form of the parable is a diptych,[122] rather than the triptych suggested above. The first section of the diptych, including v34, is no more than a 'drawing near' of the eschatological moment of truth. Its actual arrival, the second section of the diptych, is dealt with in v39. Hubaut does not mean that the 'drawing near' of the moment of truth is unimportant. On the contrary, it is serious enough in itself to mean judgment on the Jewish people and their replacement by new tenants.[123] This solution goes together with Hubaut's source-critical theories: Matthew

---

home. See Derrett, *Law*, 291. A difficulty in interpreting ἀπεδήμησεν of Christ's departure in preparation for his Parousia is that κύριος in 21:40 refers to God (see section 3) below).

(ii) ἐξέδετο/ἐξέδοτο.

Moulton, *Grammar*, I 55, comments that the Papyri agree with the NT uncials in showing ἐξέδετο as well as ἐξέδοτο (see Blass, Debrunner, Funk, *Grammar* §94.1). Some take this to be an example of a literary and a vernacular form. However, there are other examples of these alternative forms as textual variants in the LXX: Ex 2:21; 1 Macc 10:58; 4 Kgs 12:11. In the sense of 'let out for hire' the Middle of this Verb is found in Polybius 6.17.2.

[121] Hengel, *Zenonpapyri*, 22 n.72.

[122] Hubaut, *Vignerons*, 28-32, regards v33 as introducing two sections: vv34-39 on persecution and vv40-43 on God's reaction. According to Hubaut this is Matthew's arrangement, to deal with the problem caused by allegorizing his (that is, the owner's) fruit.

[123] Hubaut, *Vignerons*, sees καιρός as identifiable with the cross and resurrection. But that is too narrow. Matthew can regard a moment as eschatological because it concerns the realization of righteousness and justice. The use of καιρός in Josephus is a useful guide: 1) the right time, the favourable moment, opportunity, possibility; 2) the point of time, the period of time, the interval, the anniversary, the limited period, harvest season; 3) the hour, the moment, the circumstances, the state of affairs, the occasion, the temporary circumstances; 4) the critical moment, the dangerous situation, bad times, the emergency. The reader would read the καιρός of the parable within that choice.

has, he suggests, inherited a source[124] which, in contrast to Matthew's own theological position, spoke of the servants as heralding the approach of the harvest itself. Matthew had edited the material, so Hubaut argues, in such a way as to secure the centrality of Jesus Christ in his salvation-historical scheme, although conceding to the prophets of the Old Testament, present here in the guise of the servants in Mt 21:34, a place within God's scheme of judgment. According to Hubaut, the juxtaposition in Mt 21:34 of ἤγγισεν and καιρὸς presents a problem which is insoluble except in terms of the Matthean redaction of that kind of earlier source. However, an alternative and more satisfactory solution is that Matthew recalled at the beginning of the parable the temporal clause and vocabulary at Mt 21:1/Mk 11:1. Such temporal clauses belong within the narrative folk style inherited from the LXX[125] by the New Testament writers,[126] although a temporal clause was not the most obvious option. A more obvious option would have been a Genitive Absolute of temporal circumstances, the construction frequently employed by parables and fables at this stage in the narrative (i.e. after the opening stage setting, and at the moment where action is to begin).[127] The choice of the particular temporal clause in Mt 21:34 therefore needs explanation, and a possible explanation is that ἤγγισεν and the ὅτε clause may have been generated in 21:34 by Mt 21:1.

So far the redactor's work. But what of the material with which Matthew was working? The Marcan material already included καιρός and τῶν καρπῶν. Mark had used them separately to underline the expectation and the disappointment distinctive of his telling of the parable of *The Tenants*. Matthew took over καιρός and used it in the secular sense of 'harvest time'.[128] Associated with καιρός as 'harvest time' was καρπός, and καρπός appears insistently throughout the second half of ch. 21 (21:34 (2x) 21:41 and 21:43). The reinforcement of the term by repetition reminds one strongly of the John the Baptist tradition. Immediately before the parable of

---

[124] The earlier source is a kind of 'swan-song' of the Jerusalem tradition, arising from the experience of persecution. Hubaut is right that there are signs of pre-Matthean material, but he confuses various levels of material because he has no adequate means to distinguish them.

[125] See Tobit 2:1.

[126] ὅτε δὲ

Mt 9:25 Diff Mk >;
Mt 21:34 Diff Mk >;
Mt 13:26 No Par;
Lk 15:30 No Par (Parable).
Acts 9x; Galatians 4x.

[127] In the first twenty fables in the collected edition of Aesop's works a Genitive Absolute begins a section in 42 examples. Only in one case does ὅτε stand at the beginning of a fable.

[128] See n.123 above.

The Tenants is the parable of *The Two Sons*, the conclusion of which also summarizes the Baptist tradition.[129] There are links between *The Two Sons* and *The Tenants*, and these will be considered in detail later. For the moment it is sufficient to recognize that one possible solution to Hubaut's dilemma might be, first, to ascribe the formation of the temporal clause and choice of the Verb ἐγγίζω in v34 to the redactor, based on 21:1, and then to suggest that Matthew was editing a post-Marcan tradition which linked the two parables, *The Two Sons* and *The Tenants*.[130]

The call for righteousness in the work of John the Baptist[131] is part of the long history of prophetic activity to which the parable of *The Tenants* points in all its synoptic versions.[132] The prophets called for righteousness, as John did, and their time was a time of challenge to produce the fruits of righteousness. *The Tenants* in Mark's Gospel follows an explicit reference to John the Baptist,[133] which would encourage the reader to identify one of the servants sent to the tenants as John the Baptist. The same is true for Luke's Gospel (20:4).[134]

Mt 21:34 is the final redactor's work, and develops on the basis of a post-Marcan tradition the associations between the parable and John the Baptist.

3) Mt 21:35's reference to the owner's slaves uses distinctive vocabulary and word order. Why is this?

According to 21:35 the owner's servants were 'beaten...killed...stoned'. The order of these actions is unexpected, and in the light of 21:39 difficult to understand. It is different from Mark's terminology in the reference to 'stoning', and lacks the two Marcan terms (Mk 12:4) ἐκεφαλαίωσαν 'beat about the head'[135] and ἠτίμασαν 'treat with disrespect'.[136] Both ἐλιθοβόλησαν in Mt 21:35 and ἠτίμασαν in Mk 12:4 have a background in

---

[129] Schulz, *Q*, 316, treats the Plural as redactional. But Mt 3:8 Par Lk (Matthew Singular; Luke Plural) illustrates the danger of that classification. Hauck, *TDNT*, 3.614-616, suggests that the fruits/work association is evidence of a Semitic source. The weakness of this argument is evident from a review of Philo's use of καρπός, where καρπός is linked with all manner of good works.

[130] Klauck, *Weinberg*, 122-3; Derrett, *Law*, 293. On the variety of legal agreements in the ancient world, see Wolf, *Recht*, 261ff. The association of the parable of *The Tenants* with *The Two Sons* suggests a stage of *The Tenants* in which personal responsibility is being seen at the level of the owner's investment, that is, in terms of 21:32, the satisfying of God's demand for justice.

[131] See 21:32.

[132] Hill, *Prophecy*, 155.

[133] Trilling, *Wahre Israel*, 46.

[134] On Lk 20:10, see Marshall, *Luke*, 729.

[135] Pesch, *Markus-Evangelium*, 216; Derrett, *Law*, 298 n.4.

[136] Pesch, *Markus-Evangelium*, 217.

the prophetic tradition,[137] although not exclusively there.[138] ἐλιθοβόλησαν belongs specifically to the context of Israel's refusal to listen to the prophets, thus incurring divine displeasure and punishment (see 2 Chron 24:17-21; 36:15-16; Neh 9:26).[139] The reason for the inclusion of ἐλιθοβόλησαν in 21:35, and its appearance at the end of the list there, may well be that of establishing a link between this point in the narrative and the rejection of the prophets.

The rejection of the prophets and its consequences are found in a Q pericope, Lk 11:49-51/Mt 23:34-36. This is explicitly related both to Jerusalem and to the stoning of the prophets in Mt 23:37-39/Lk13:34.[140] The parallel between Q and 2 Chron 24:17-21 is also evident. The Matthean version of this Q material warns of an impending judgment, and this motif is expressed in the quotation in Mt 23:39 from Ps 117, the same psalm which provides the conclusion to the parable of *The Tenants* in all the Synoptic Gospels.[141] There are therefore several links between the Q material and the Matthean parable of *The Tenants*:

In detailing the fate of the messengers, Mt 21:35 has an enumerative use of the Particles μὲν and δὲ which cannot safely be described as an editorial technique (see Lk 11:48 Diff Mt; Lk 23:33 Diff Mk).[142]

Mt 21:36 contains a number of flashbacks to the parable of *The Two Sons*. The phrase ἐποίησαν αὐτοῖς ὡσαύτως resembles the expression in 21:30. It has distinct LXX affinities (Ex 7:22; 8:7,18).[143] ὡσαύτως[144] is

---

[137] Jeremias, *Parables*, 72; Trilling, *Wahre Israel*, 56 n.9; Dillon, *Parables*, 17 n.1. The case for an intention to link the story at this point of the narrative with the fate of the prophets is very strong. 2 Chron 24:21 alone of the uses in the LXX of λιθοβολέω (except 1 Kgs 30:6; 3 Kgs 20:10) has the Verb without λίθοις. In view of the range of uses of the word this idiosyncracy is noteworthy. See also Acts 7:58-9; 14:5; and Heb 12:20.

[138] 1 Thess 2:15-16.

[139] Hoffmann, *Logienquelle*, 173; Wilckens, *TDNT*, 7.465ff.

[140] Hoffmann, *Logienquelle*, 179-180.

[141] Garland, *Matthew 23*, 207 n.138.

[142] See p.253 n.262.

[143] ὡσαύτως LXX: 37x (e.g. Epistle of Jer 22,28,35,61,71); with λαλέω Proverbs 3x; Macc 1-3 (narratives). Also found in legal documents among the Zenon Papyri.

[144] ὡσαύτως Schenk, *Sprache*, 469; Gundry, *Matthew*, 649; Neirynck, *Vocabulary*, 334.

All the synoptic uses are in parables.

Mt 4x:	20:5	No Par;
	21:30	No Par;
	21:36	Diff Mk;
	25:17	Diff Lk (>*Lk) = 'in the same way'.
Mk 2x:	12:21	Diff Mt (Mt ὁμοίως; Lk supports Mark);
	14:31	Diff Mt (Mt ὁμοίως).

of some consequence because its synonym, ὁμοίως, has considerable claim to be an editorial preference of Matthew.[145] παλίν often serves as a traditional connecting link.[146] So 21:36 could well be further evidence for a pre-Matthean stage of the parable, a stage at which the two parables were linked together. If, as seems likely, 21:35 and 36 represent the same stage, the pre-Matthean parable collection may be identified as a warning of God's judgment on those who reject his prophets and their call for righteousness.

4) Mt 21:37 omits one of the most significant features of the parable in its Marcan form, ἀγαπητός (Mk 12:6 cf. Lk 20:31). Why should Matthew have left out such a crucial word?

ἀγαπητός is omitted by Matthew in the parable of *The Tenants*; it is added in the formula quotation of Mt 12:18, and retained in the Baptismal Commendation at Mt 3:17.[147] The inclusion of ἀγαπητός in Mt 12:18 may well be an editorial addition,[148] associating sonship with the service of

---

Lk 3x: 20:31 Par Mk;
13:5 No Par;
22:20 Diff Mk.

[145] On ὁμοίως καί, see Schenk, *Sprache*, 373.

[146] παλίν Schenk, *Sprache*, 397; Gundry, *Matthew*, 647; Neirynck, *Vocabulary*, 300.

Mt 17x: 5x No Par; 5x Par Mk; 3x Diff Mk; 4x Diff Lk
Mk 28x: 5x Par Mt; 2x Diff Mt or >*Mt; 13x >*; 8x >
Lk 3x: 1x Par Mk; 2x Diff Mt

Schenk subdivides the uses. At first sight his subdivisions seem impressive but further consideration of them suggests otherwise: e.g. at the beginning of a sentence:

Mk 6x καὶ παλίν at the beginning of a sentence.
2x Par Mt; 3x Diff Mt; 1x >*;
Mk 14:61 Diff Mt (Mt has καὶ; Mk has παλίν);
Lk 23:20 Diff Mk (in order)/Par Mk (using παλίν) (Diff Mt).

See also ch.1 n.18 (iii). On the basis suggested in that note, Mk 14:61 and Lk 23:20 are part of a recognizable pattern. On Schenk's theory it is inexplicable. Several of the subdivisions illustrate formulaic patterns (as in the case of the Passion Narratives and the parables).

[147] Gundry, *Old Testament*, 9ff, 110ff.

[148] The inclusion of the word in Mt 12:18 may well be significant since it occurs in a quotation from Isa 42, the Greek versions of which have no exact equivalent to ἀγαπητός (see Stendahl, *School*, 110). Its presence in this version of the quotation is variously explained. The main explanation offered is that it was introduced as a result of the tradition represented in 3:17 and 17:5 (Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 73; Barth, *Gesetzesverständnis*, 118; a tradition of some antiquity: Strecker, *Gerechtigkeit*, 69). The accompanying relative clause (Strecker, *Gerechtigkeit*, 69 n.4) may reflect a text form of Isa 42:1 similar to that of Theodotion and Symmachus ὃν ηὐδόκησεν, and this later part of the verse seems to have been anticipated in Mt 12:18a by a targumizing interpretation using the same relative clausal structure ὃν ἠρέτισα, an expression closer to the LXX in Isa 42:1, ἐκλεκτος. An alternative explanation derives ἀγαπητός from

God's just demands.[149] The choice of terminology there would be derived from the Baptismal Commendation.[150] In the light of that, it is hard to explain the omission of ἀγαπητός in 21:37 as a Matthean omission. It is more likely that the omission is pre-Matthean, perhaps as the sentence was re-ordered when *The Tenants* and *The Two Sons* were linked.[151] Any other solution, including that of De Kruijf, who understands the omission as a Matthean attempt to give added emphasis to the uniqueness of Jesus' divine sonship,[152] would require a different judgment on 12:18, particularly in view of the very similar context to which 12:18 and 21:3 belong (i.e. an attack on the Jewish leadership for its failure to produce good fruit).

The re-ordering of 21:37 was prompted by the introduction of the link-word ὕστερον. ὕστερον in 21:32 was used in the Wisdom sense of 'later', but in 21:37 it reappears in its equally well-documented sense of 'finally'[153] (as a variation for the Marcan ἔσχατον,[154] see Mt 22:27; Lk 20:32; Diff

---

the Abraham–Isaac typology (Wood, *Isaac*, 586; Bowker, *Targum*, 228ff) since ἀγαπητός appears in the LXX of Genesis 22:2, followed by the relative clause ὃν ἠγάπησας. See also the martyr interpretation of ἀγαπητός *TDNT*, I.48. The issue of Matthew's redactional hand in this rests on the wider questions of whether Matthew took over a text form unknown to us (either translation or a testimonium), or redrafted the text to fit particular functions or interests in its context (McConnell, *Law*, 124f; van Segbroeck, *Citations*, 107ff), or a mixture of these possibilities (Luz, *Matthew*, II 246), or inherited or took part in a tradition of translation work. Within those latter theories the influence of a baptismal commendation cannot be discounted (see Turner, *ΑΓΑΠΗΤΟΣ*, 113ff; Davies, *Matthew*, II 325ff), nor the influence of messianic traditions (Berger, *Messiastraditionen*, 1ff).

149 Hill, *Son and Servant*, 2-16.

150 Lindars, *Apologetic*, 139-152; Hooker, *Servant*, 69-73; Lampe, *Spirit*, 70.

151 See p.389.

152 Since 'his son' expresses in Matthew the uniqueness of Christ's divine sonship, argues De Kruijf, *Sohn*, 139ff, the omission of ἀγαπητός in Mt 21:37 represents an intensification and not a weakening of the Marcan original. De Kruijf is justified in objecting to the view that the omission was due to the inessential character of the word (Hengel, *Weingärtnern*, 30). It is one thing to avoid the word in the first place because the narrative does not require it, which is Hengel's case; it is quite another to omit it deliberately from a current tradition. See van Iersel, *Sohn*, 138. Klauck, *Allegorie*, 287, 291, suggests that in Mark it operates as a structural signal; its omission in Matthew was due to the ecclesiological and paraenetic nuance of the parable.

153 Prov 5:4; 23:31(32). In the sense of 'later' it is used in the LXX with the Verb μετανοέω: Prov 24:47(32); Jer 36(29):2: Senior, *Passion*, 165 n.1.

154 ὕστερον Schenk, *Sprache*, 452; Gundry, *Matthew*, 648.

Mt 7x:	4:2	Diff Lk	= later;
	21:29	No Par	= last (with μεταμεληθείς);
	21:32	No Par	= last (with μεταμεληθείς);
	21:37	Diff Mk = ὕστερον δὲ Mt / Mk ἔσχατον;	

Mk 12:22). This re-ordering of 21:37a contrasts with the remarkable agreement of 21:37b in all the Gospel versions of this parable.[155]

5) Mt 21:38 refers to κληρονόμος and κληρονομία. What do these words mean? Why are they in the parable?

According to Derrett[156] the normal association of the κληρονόμος/ κληρονομία group of words would be 'acquisition'. The tenants would have viewed the son as having 'acquired' the rights of the estate, the better to take a last opportunity of pressing the owner's claim The potential area of meaning for this group of words cannot however with any security be defined in this way. Josephus used the Verb of acquiring a vineyard by force (Ant 8:359-360) and used the Nouns in the technical sense of inheritance.[157] The question therefore is whether the legal language which Derrett regards as normal[158] was sufficiently widespread to provide a background for the translation of κληρονόμος and κληρονομία in this parable.

A better explanation of the Marcan use of the two nouns in this parable, but one which does not necessarily require that they should belong to an original form of the parable,[159] is that they suggest three important and

---

	22:27	Diff Mk = ὕστερον δὲ Mt + Genitive/ Mk ἔσχατον;
	25:11	No Par = ὕστερον; see Bonnard, *Matthieu*;
	26:60	Diff Mk = finally.
Mk 1x:	16:1	Text? = thereafter;
Lk 1x:	20:32	Diff Mk = finally (=Mt 22:37 above).

Note the Historic Present in Mt 25:11 (see Schenk, *Sprache*, 452). What is striking here is the spread of usage, with a cluster of four examples in chs. 21-22 and the isolated Mt 4:2 passage in a context otherwise marked by exact agreements between Matthew and Luke. Either this is to be classed as editorial, or it is to be classed as Q^{MT} and as a link-word infiltrating the process of narration.

ἔσχατος Schenk, *Sprache*, 261; Gundry, *Matthew*, 644; Neirynck, *Vocabulary*, 253.

Mt 10x: 6x No Par; 2x Par Mk; 2x Par Lk
Mk 5x: 2x Par Mt; 2x Diff Mt; 1x >
Lk 6x: 1x No Par; 2x Par Mk; 2x Par Mt

155 Spicq, *υἱον*, 73 n.1.

156 Derrett, *Law*, 306.

157 κληρονομέω: see Josephus Ant 8.359-360, of the acquisition by murder of Naboth's vineyard. κληρονομία: Josephus War 2.249; Ant 16:16 of inheriting and inheritance. κληρονόμος: Josephus War 1.40 with βασιλεία; War 6.188; Ant 13:322 in a metaphorical sense (a patrimony of patricide).

158 See p.379 n. 130.

159 Hengel, *Weingärtnern*, 30, 36 n.114, criticizes Derrett for too much attention to the legal background of the parable. But he himself accepts uncritically a social background which does not fit the narrative; his argument assumes that the tenants have a responsibility from the beginning, whereas the text suggests that they only come on the scene after the basic work is complete. It might be argued that the cooperation of the tenants is implied in the statement

interlocking areas of discourse: the vineyard as a valuable piece of property, the vineyard as symbolic of Israel's inheritance, and the vineyard as claimed for God's people by the divine representative. The choice of κληρονόμος/κληρονομία would then belong with the formulation of the Baptismal Commendation (Mk 1:11 and parallels), and with Mark's use of the parable to emphasize Jesus' role as Son of God.[160] Those to whom the promise of the inheritance was originally made have been deprived of their hope. Now God's representative and theirs has come to claim it. The leaders of the people receive the blame, and the Son opens up a way for the promise to be recovered. So the parable of *The Tenants*, with κληρονόμος/κληρονομία at its centre and using features of Isaiah 5,[161] stands at the heart of the Marcan Controversy material. That is perhaps the best background[162] against which to understand κληρονόμος/κληρονομία[163] in the Marcan version.

That background also provides a good base for evaluating the subsequent developments of the parable. The attack on the leadership for having forfeited Israel's inheritance was given a new context in the post-Marcan period. 21:38 may belong to this stage, in which the prophetic summons to righteousness is identified with Christ's ministry and message.[164]

---

about the initial preparations. But that precisely makes the point that the parable is a simplified presentation of a social phenomenon and this can tempt, and even encourage, the reader to go beyond the text.

[160] Source criticism of Mark's Gospel requires us to explain the position of the parable directly before the Controversy Collection. On a possible pre-Marcan unit in the parable, see Klauck, *Allegorie*, 294; on the Marcan language, see Klauck, *Allegorie*, 288 n.10.

[161] In the Isaiah Targum the vineyard is called אחסנא (inheritance). On the complex relationship between all Israel as inheritor of the promises and the fate of the just and the rejected, see Sanders, *Judaism*, 404-406, especially on the Psalms of Solomon; see also Jones, *Matthew*, 134.

[162] See Romans 8:18.

[163] Hooker, *Mark*, 276.

[164] 21:38 has three characteristics:

1) a rhythmic scheme, measured in syllables. The introduction has syllables in three groups, 9:10:11, i.e. three almost equal phrases;

2) ἐν ἑαυτοῖς with a Verb of saying is a traditional formula:

Mt	7x:	1x Par Lk; 6x Diff Mk; 1x Diff Lk
Mk	3x:	1x Diff Mt; 2x >*
Lk	6x:	5x No Par; 1x Par Mt

3) The use of two Jussives: this is often treated as editorial. In fact the two Jussives are without parallel in Matthew and replace the Jussive + Imperative followed by καὶ and the Future tense in Mk 12:7. The distribution of uses of Imperative + Jussive and double Jussive is not easily explicable on editorial theories: see Mt 27:42 Imperative καὶ + Future tense, compared with Mark ἵνα + two Subjunctives (Luke has no parallel; compare Mt 9:18 with Mk 5:23, and again Luke has no parallel); see Mt 5:44f, where two Imperatives may be compared with Luke's Imperative + καὶ and the Future (compare Mt 23:26 and Lk

6) Mt 21:39 has been said to reflect the Passion Narrative. Does it do so? In Mark the tenants kill the son before they drag him out of the vineyard. In Matthew and Luke they kill him outside the walls. Why this alteration? Was it because the crucifixion of Jesus took place outside the walls of Jerusalem? This would require the assumption that the vineyard stands for Jerusalem. There is one way in which the assumption might make the change in Matthew and Luke less easy to understand. There is the adage that a prophet could not possibly die outside Jerusalem. Alternatively, it could be argued that the alteration was made because of the dangers inherent in committing murder within a vineyard.[165] Such an act could prejudice its future use. The agreement between Matthew and Luke might in that case suggest that the development of the Marcan tradition took place in a situation where Pharisaic debates were well known,[166] and where it was known that a vineyard spoilt in this way would be doomed. However, even should that be the case, it would be hard to rule out the possibility of an influence on the parable from the Passion Narrative.[167]

7) Mt 21:40 refers to the ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος. To whom does this refer?

The parable is dependent on Isaiah 5. That is true in several ways, but it is particularly so when we relate Mk 12:9 (Mt 21:40; Lk 20:15) to Isa 5:4. The LXX of Is 5:4 reads: τὶ ποιήσω ἔτι τῷ ἀμπελῶνί μου...; Such a rhetorical question, posed to the hearers, is otherwise unknown within the narrative of Matthean parables and is found only elsewhere in the Lucan. It is presented by Isaiah in the first-person Singular. Mark uses it of the owner in the third person, effectively destroying in the parable of *The Tenants* any residual element of surprise surviving from the Isaianic original. It is clear that Jerusalem is the vineyard and that God will judge his people.

In Matthew the rhetorical question is answered by the hearers: κακοὺς κακῶς ἀπολέσει αὐτούς, and it is difficult to judge whether the question and answer have become the moral conclusion to the parable or whether they are a novel continuation of the parable. 21:31 presents a similar case; the question is posed within the parable and answered by the hearers. In the Matthean parable of *The Tenants* this dialogue makes abundantly clear that the owner in 21:40 is none other than God. The owner's actions are

---

11:41); two Imperatives in Mt 6:33=Lk 12:31; Matthew 20:28 (D Θ it) Imperative + καὶ and the Future compared with Luke 14:10 Imperative + ἵνα. There are further examples of this variety of usage: e.g. Mt 27:17 and pars; 26:41 and pars. See also Beyer, *Semitische Syntax*, I.253. The best explanation of this variety is that of traditional formulae common to the Gospel tradition.

165 Derrett, *Law*, 307.

166 Derrett, *Law*, 307 n.2, on bSan 104b.

167 Daniel, *Anti-Semitism*, 45ff.

described in terms appropriate to God; they lack any of the ambiguity of Isa 5:5. κακοὺς κακῶς illustrates the point. It is a classicism,[168] used in the LXX but not elsewhere in the Synoptics, with the implications here of bringing the evil to an evil end. The same conclusion can be drawn from 21:41b.[169] The emphasis on divine destruction is unmistakable.[170]

8) Mt 21:42 quotes from Ps 117:22f, following Mark. What is its force? The answer has three stages. First, in Matthew 21:42 the quotation from Ps 117(118):22f uses a text form found also in Mark, in 1 Pet.2:6 and Barnabas 6:4. Only Matthew and Mark in the New Testament quote in their entirety both vv22-23 of the Psalm.[171] In Matthew the Psalm quotation follows a threat and a promise; the threat is the destruction of the tenants, and the promise is the passing over of the vineyard to new tenants. If, as is very likely, by this stage in the pericope the vineyard represents not the physical Jerusalem but Jerusalem in a metaphorical sense, the place of divine promise and choice, and therefore represents the promise of the Kingdom, then Mt 21:41 would mean that the promise of the Kingdom has passed from one group to another. 21:42 would correspond to this, particularly as the transfer of the Kingdom from one to another is made in another 'stone' passage, Dan 2:44f. Mt 21:42[172] refers to one who is first rejected, but then vindicated; the people who reject him are themselves judged; others, amazingly, accept him as the cornerstone. Understood in this way, 21:42 flows naturally into 21:43.[173]

Second, the Lucan use of Ps 117:22 follows a pattern found in other parts of the New Testament. In Acts 4:11, Ps 117:22 appears in a different text form as part of an attack on the leaders of Israel. Elsewhere in early Christian literature the Psalm verse is expanded by various additions. Further

---

[168] Lohmeyer–Schmauch, *Matthäus*, 313 n.1. κακοὺς κακῶς is without parallel in the LXX or the remainder of the New Testament. The closest Palestinian parallel is Josephus Ant 7.11.8 and 11.5.4.

[169] See p.480.

[170] The future of this Verb in the sense of 'destroy' is not found elsewhere in the Synoptics nor in the remainder of the New Testament. It is characteristic of the prophetic threat: Isa 1:25; 13:11; 14:22; 29:14; Jer 26(46)8; 31(48)35. Since this Verb is much used in other forms in the Synoptics (Mt 19x, Mk 10x, Lk 27x) the use of the Future and its context in the prophetic threat is probably significant. See Pesch, *Markus-Evangelium*, 220.

[171] Gundry, *Old Testament*, 20 n.3, accepts Jeremias's judgment that κεφαλὴ γωνίας means 'capstone', unwisely in view of McKelvey, *Cornerstone*. In Matthew, Jesus introduces the quotation himself. On Luke, see Marshall, *Luke*, 732. On Mark's introduction, which resembles Mk 2:25 and points to 12:20, see Klauck, *Allegorie*.

[172] Swaeles, *Arrière-fond*, 310ff.

[173] On διὰ τοῦτο, see Garland, *Matthew 23*, 174; also p.193 n.75, where the use of this introduction for the classic invective threat is listed.

Old Testament verses, notably Isa 28:16 LXX^{A}, are joined to Ps 117:22 in 1 Pet 2:6 and Barnabas 6:2, and Isa 8:14f LXX$^{A \text{ and } B}$ in 1 Pet 2:6.[174] This expresses a contrast between those who believe in the Chosen One and those who do not, and the fate of each is described correspondingly. Luke's version of Ps 117:22 in his parable of *The Tenants* is similarly expanded with a verse taken from Dan 2:44 and Isa 8:15.[175] The parable is interrupted by a cry of horror at such a judgment (20:16). There is no doubt about its reality and intensity; in Luke the judgment will mean 'pulverisation'.[176]

Third, a verse very similar to Lk 20:18 is found in most MSS of Matthew's Gospel at 21:44. Because D 33 b ff^{1} ff^{2} r^{1} sy^{s} Ir Or^{part} Eus lack the verse, it is often treated as an accretion. The Matthean text is regarded as glossed from the Lucan.[177] The decision is not an easy one. It could well be that 21:44 concludes the section with a judgment, as Matthew's text so often does; such a conclusion does not destroy the balance of promise and threat which has been characteristic of vv40-43. D it and sy^{s}, the so-called Western text, frequently agree in leaving out whole verses in the text of Matthew, often where they appear to be trying to clarify the argument. Whatever the value of the Western text, in no other case is their omission to be upheld as the original text of Matthew. Moreover, if 21:44 is a gloss from the Lucan text, it is strange that 21:44 occupies a different position in relation to the Psalm quotation from that occupied by Lk 20:18. So Mt 21:44 may be part of the authentic text of Matthew. If it is, then an explanation is needed for its appearance and for its position. One possibility

---

[174] At what stage did Ps 117 enter the synoptic tradition? Black, *Christological*, suggests a word-play at the Hebrew level. Lindars, *Apologetic*, 169-174, distinguishes an early stage (Acts 4:11) where Ps 117:22 is part of the Passion apologetic, and a later stage (1 Pet 2:6; Barn 6:2-4) where Christ is the rejected stone. There is no reason why in the time of the Gospels the use of Ps 117 should not have occupied the middle ground, holding together within divine providence (vv22-23) the two Marcan areas: on the one hand Mark's ἀπεδοκίμασαν (see Mk 8:31) and οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες with its precise reference to the rejection of Jesus by the Jewish leaders; and on the other hand Mark's vindication of the rejected one and the raising up of the 'living temple' (Mk 14:58; 15:29): see Hooker, *Mark*, 358-359.

[175] See Lindars, *Apologetic*, 183-186, who describes a post-Pauline anti-Judaic propaganda based on Ps 117. Certainly Paul did not see the matter in that way (Rom 9:33; see Isa 28:15f; Rom 10:10 and 11:10). He saw the case for Israel's rejection on the grounds of the killing of the prophets (Rom 11:2-3) but regarded that interpretation as shortsighted: God would win a new response from Israel. Was Lk 20:17c an alternative solution to Paul's? Lk 20:16 suggests an argumentative conclusion: with Dan 2:44 the fate of unresponsive Jews was firmly set within the context of world judgment.

[176] Marshall, *Luke*, 732. For συνθλασθήσεται, see Ps 110(109):5-6 LXX.

[177] Metzger, *Commentary*, 58; Aland, P^{75}, 155ff; Snodgrass, *Western Non-Interpolations*, 369-379.

is that the two sets of Old Testament quotations, Ps 117:22(23) and Dan 2:44, Isa 8:15, grew together in the post-Marcan period, emphasizing the totality of God's judgment on Jerusalem, to be separated by 21:43, with its διὰ τοῦτο at the linking of the parables of *The Two Sons* and *The Tenants* and its associated theme of replacement (The Kingdom will be taken from you and given to a people who produce its fruits; see 21:41b).[178] The Western text would then resemble an editorial attempt to make the section finish with a characteristic Matthean διὰ τοῦτο.[179] The explanation meets many of the difficulties, although it depends on 21:43 being pre-Matthean (see 9) below).

9) Mt 21:43 is found only in Matthew. Did Matthew create it?
Hubaut distinguishes the opening of the verse, which he characterizes as Matthean, from the later part of the verse, which has unusual features. He takes this later part of the verse to be the pre-Matthean conclusion to the parable, coming from the Jewish Christian environment of that source. Like vv41-43 it draws on terms indicating the removal of the divine presence from the false Israel, and its gift to the true, eschatological Israel.[180] His argument depends on three features of the verse: Hubaut assumes the opening to be the work of the final editor. διὰ τοῦτο[181] could, however, belong to pre-Matthean material. Hubaut assumes a difference of nuance between βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν and the phrase used here, βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ;[182] but this is unlikely, as βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ lacks any kind of distinctive use in Matthew (see the use of this phrase for the present Kingdom in Mt 12:28 and the future Kingdom in 21:31), and identical themes are linked with both βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ and βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν (see Mt 19:23 and 24, and 19:12). The two uses of βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ in close proximity here in ch. 21 each have a balancing function:[183] judgment on the one side[184] is balanced by gift to the others. Third, Hubaut regards

[178] For the argument that Mt 21:44 is not redundant, see Sheppard, *Thomas*, 187f, who does not however monitor accurately the differences in emphasis and order between Mt 21:44 and Lk 20:18.

[179] See p.193 n.75.

[180] Hubaut, *Vignerons*, 67-95.

[181] Hubaut, *Vignerons*, 67 n.6, and 68.

[182] Hubaut, *Vignerons*, 72 n.3, where Kretzer is quoted on βασιλεία τοῦ θεου. Two major difficulties with Kretzer's position are that it requires the central phrase in Mt 21:43 to be understood in two different ways, and that it leaves the final Pronoun without a satisfactory sense. On the history of the parable's tradition, see Dillon, *Parable*, 1-41, and Carlston, *Triple Tradition*, 44 n.23.

[183] 21:31 emphasizes God's grace for those who do not deserve it; 21:43 refers to the Kingdom's wider privileges and responsibilities.

[184] αἴρω Schenk, *Sprache*, 464; Neirynck, *Vocabulary*, 209.
Mt 19x: 4x No Par; 11x Par Mk; 3x Par Lk; 1x Diff Lk
Mk 19x: 11x Par Mt; 4x Diff Mt; 4x >

the use of the Singular, as distinct from the Plural with its Gentile connotations, as an attempt to indicate the replacement of the synagogue community with a new object for the Gospel's work. Certainly the Singular is unusual;[185] but from the context it must refer to those who produce the fruit of the Kingdom, which presumably might include both Jews and Gentiles: i.e. ἔθνος here lacks specific racial connotations; it refers to an obedient people.

(iv–v) *The History of the Parables and the History of Redaction*

1) The Matthean form of the parable is due to an association of the parable of the *The Tenants* with *The Two Sons*, in a context in which the rejection of the prophets and the rejection of the Son of God were associated emphatically with the rejection by God of Israel's leaders and their replacement with an obedient people.

2) This association of parables influenced the narrative of the parable of *The Tenants* in a number of ways. The fate of the prophetic messengers was presented differently; there was a greater emphasis on the fruits of righteousness; the judgment theme from Isa 5 was further strengthened.

3) The final Matthean redaction consisted in the rephrasing of certain sections, under LXX influence and in dependence on Isa 5. These enabled the writer to use the Marcan outline so as to give the prophetic element a greater role, to use 21:11 and 21:46 as structural guides (Jesus is the Prophet), to make the Jewish leaders illustrations of the universal need to repent, and thus to make the section a declaration on the one hand of Christ's prophetic call for repentance and righteousness, and on the other of the privileges of faithful obedience.

Lk 20x: 4x No Par; 8x Par Mk; 3x Par Mt; 5x Diff Mt

Schenk suggests that the imperatival use in the mouth of Jesus is a Matthean trait. Apart from dubious statistics at this point and an incorrect reference, all the Matthean examples of the imperatival use have parallels in other Gospels, and Luke has one additional example Diff Mk and Diff Mt. For the double Imperatives with ὕπαγε, see p.19 n.19.

185 ἔθνος

Schenk, *Sprache*, 217; Gundry, *Matthew*, 643; Neirynck, *Vocabulary*, 238.

Singular

Mt 2x Par Mk (Tribe / Nation).
Mk 2x Par Mt (Tribe / Nation).
Lk 2x Par Mk (Tribe / Nation)
2x No Par (Nation)

Plural

Mt 13x: 8x No Par; 2x Par Mk; 2x Diff Mk; 1x Par Lk.
Mk 4x: 2x Par Mt; 2x >*.
Lk 9x: 6x No Par; 2x Par Mk; 1x Par Mt.

See also pp.245-249.

From the point of view of the history of parables, this is further illustration of a Matthean narrative parable which does not fit the usual classifications. The parable as used by Mark had a distinctive form, partly due to the controversy material which it was designed to introduce; and it was this form which became a dominating influence during the oral period. It was basically a historical narrative recalling God's mercy and God's demands upon Israel, culminating in the ministry and rejection of Jesus and a consequent warning to the leaders of Israel. The Matthean form of *The Tenants* retained the narrative outline and a number of traditional features as it developed. It thus incorporated didactic features, culminating in a major reconstruction of the narrative's historical basis.

E. *The Two Sons* Mt 21:28-32

(i) *The Context*

The Marcan context associates the question about the authority of Jesus (Mt 21:23-27/Mk 11:27-33/Lk 20:1-8) with a secrecy motif (Mk 11:33 and parallels)[186] and with the parable of *The Tenants*. Together these interpret the *Cleansing of the Temple*[187] as a prophetic drama of the Temple's destruction.[188] In Mark the episode of *The Fig Tree* (Mk 11:12f,20ff) points in the same direction;[189] the mountainous obstacle which is to be removed is nothing less than the Temple itself.[190] Matthew avoids giving any such impression.[191] *The Fig Tree* episode (Mt 21:18-22) becomes a judgment on the fruitless.[192] The opposition to the *Cleansing of the Temple* by the scribes and priests is turned into a contrast between the 'believing children

---

186 Telford, *Barren Temple*, 256ff.

187 Telford, *Barren Temple*, 253f.

188 Hooker, *Mark*, 266; Telford, *Barren Temple*, 238.

189 Telford, *Barren Temple*, 218.

190 Telford, *Barren Temple*, 170 n.63.

191 Barrett, *House of Prayer*, 16-17: 'Matthew...omits Mk 11:16 and πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν. He thus underlines the Temple's lack of future (and predicts its destruction in 24:2); but he goes on to describe miracles of healing in the Temple, the children who cry "Hosanna to the Son of David", and Jesus' quotation of Ps 8:3. He thus suggests a more positive evaluation of the Temple at the time of the incident.' There is also the possibility that in 21:14ff a reconsecration of the Temple is intended.

192 Telford, *Barren Temple*, ch. 3, suggests that the story has been removed from the sphere of judgment and eschatology. It would be hard, in view of Matthew's use of material on 'bearing fruit', not to see here a judgment on the fruitless.

and the unbelieving sages' in Mt 11:25 (Mt 21:14),[193] and the moving of mountains is transformed into a recognition of the power available to the disciples.[194] The parable of *The Two Sons* therefore follows a section concerning the teaching authority of Jesus (Mt 21:23) against a background of the contrast between privilege and failure, and the simple and the wise.

(ii) *The Redaction*

Merkel regards the parable of *The Two Sons* as a Talmudic parable concerned with the traditional subject of 'doing God's will'.[195] His argument depends on two lists: one list of Matthean characteristics which is extensive, and another list of traditional material which is extremely short. In fact the length of the lists should be reversed. The following is the list of traditional material: τὶ ὑμῖν δοκεῖ,[196] προσελθὼν,[197] εἶπεν,[198] ὑπάγω and imperative,[199] ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν,[200] ἀπερχέσθαι,[201] ὡσαύτως,[202]

---

193 There is a tendency in commentaries to concentrate on the one group or on the other, rather than to recognize the contrast between them.

194 Telford, *Barren Temple*, 79.

195 Merkel, *Ungleichen Söhnen*, 254ff.

196 p.273 n.332 (i).

197 p.294 n.48.

198 p.473 n.218.

199 p.19 n.19.

200 p.335 n.214 (1).

201 p.292 n.46 on ἐξέρχομαι, p.295 n.48 on ἀπέρχομαι.
ἀπέρχομαι Schenk, *Sprache*, 254; Gundry, *Matthew*, 641; Neirynck, *Vocabulary*, 216; Gaston's statistics in *Horae Synopticae* are unreliable here. Only two of the 35x Mt can be questioned textually and even these are virtually certain readings.

Of the Mt 10x Diff Mk:	4x ἐξέρχομαι.
	6x >.
Of the Mk 9x Diff Mt:	2x ἀκολουθέω.
	2x ἀναχωρέω.
	2x ἀναβαίνω.
	1x καθαρίζω.
	1x εἰσέρχομαι.
	1x πορεύομαι.
Of the Lk 3x Diff Mt	1x πορεύομαι.
	1x ἐξέρχομαι.
	1x >*Mt. See Jeremias, *Sprache*, 181.

There are four interesting features of this Verb: (a) There is an interchange of related Verbs across the Gospels; (b) There is a considerable list of omissions by Matthew of Marcan uses of the Verb, and of the Participles of the Verb, whereas Matthew uses the Verb with great regularity in the parables: 13:25,28,46; 18:30; 20:5; 21:29,30; 22:5,22; 25:10,18,25,46 (all Participles), and elsewhere 6x Diff Mk; 3x Par Mk; 1x No Par (all Participles). (c) A few of the omissions by Matthew of Marcan uses share the participial form with Luke: Neirynck, *Minor*

μεταμέλομαι,[203] λέγουσιν αὐτῷ,[204] ἀμην λέγω ὑμῖν,[205] ὁδὸς δικαιοσύνης,[206] πιστεύειν + Dative,[207] βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ,[208] προάγειν εἰς,[209] ἐγὼ κύριε,[210] οὐ θέλω,[211] ἀμπελὼν.[212] In addition there are several

---

Agreements, 256. (d) The Participle of this Verb is typical of narrative fable style: see *Cor Fab Aesop*, 145 II.9.

[202] p.380 n.143 and n.144.

[203] μεταμέλομαι

Schenk, *Sprache*, 361; Gundry, *Matthew*, 646.

The Verb (Mt 3x No Par) appears only at 21:30; 21:32 and 27:3, and elsewhere in the New Testament only at 2 Cor 7:8 (= regret) and Heb 7:21 (Ps 110:4 = go back on his word). In the LXX it is found at Ex 13:17 (= change mind); 1 Sam 15:35 (= repent); Ps 105(106):45 (= relent). In Matthew 27:3 the Verb expressed Judas's remorse (Senior, *Passion*, 375f) rather than repentance (see Michel, *TDNT*, 4.626-629) although the latter sense is possible (see Test Jud 23:5). The most appropriate senses in the other Matthean contexts are 'change one's mind' or 'regret one's action'. Matthew's use of μετα-compounds does not add decisive weight to the suggestion that they are redactional; if anything it slightly increases the likelihood that they might be traditional.

μεταβαίνω	Mt 1x No Par; 3x Diff Mk; 1x Diff Lk; Lk 1x No Par.
μεταίρω	Mt 2x Diff Mk.
μεταμορφόομαι	Mt 1x Par Mk; Mk 1x Par Mt.
μετανοέω	Mt 5x: 1x No Par; 1x Par Mk; 2x Par Lk; 1x Diff Mk.
	Mk 2x: 1x Par Mt; 1x >.
	Lk 9x: 5x No Par; 2x Par Mt; 2x Diff Mt.

μεταδίδωμι and μετακαλέομαι do not appear in Matthew.

[204] p.314 n.118 (6).

[205] p.233 n.206.

[206] Przybylski, *Righteousness*, 94-98. The premise of his argument is that Mt 21:32 corresponds to βουλὴν τοῦ θεοῦ in Lk 7:30, and refers to the divine will, perhaps signifying 'bringing the message of God's will'. However, βουλὴ is a favourite word of Luke (Jeremias, *Sprache*, 165), which means that even if the two passages are parallel, the Matthean tradition of δικαιοσύνη meaning 'God's will' might be pre-Matthean (see Robinson, *Baptism of John*, 185). Once the parallel with Lk 7:30 is no longer thought to be definitive, the pre-Matthean tradition can be traced in its own context, and δικαιοσύνη as 'God's will' heard in its distinctiveness. If, as seems likely, that pre-Matthean context had links with the John the Baptist tradition, God's will may be understood as social action in the light of the coming judgment. Matthew's own use of δικαιοσύνη, although related to that, has already been seen to have many different facets (see Klein, *Frömmigkeit*).

[207] πιστεύω + Dative Schenk, *Sprache*, 406; Gundry, *Matthew*, 747.

Mt 4x: 3x No Par; 1x Par Mk
Mk 3x: 1x Par Mt; 2x Text?
Lk 1x: 1x Par Mk (contrast with Acts 6x)

[208] p.389 n.182.

[209] προάγειν Schenk, *Sprache*, 406; Gundry, *Matthew*, 747.

Mt 6x: 2x No Par; 4x Par Mk
Mk 5x: 4x Par Mt; 1x >

constructions which are traditional, e.g. the position of the numeral in 21:28,[213] and ἄνθρωπος (τις).[214] There are several words of very uncertain origin, of which ὕστερον[215] is one, but, as noted above, this also occurs in 21:37.

If the traditional character of the parable is accepted, the parable's textual history becomes particularly important. This divides itself into four groups

---

Lk 1x: 1x Diff Mk
With εἷς
Mt 4x: 1x No Par; 3x Par Mk
Mk 3x: 3x Par Mt

[210] This is probably a classicism. M'Neile's comment (*Matthew*, 306) is misleading in that it fails to make clear that the phrase ἐγὼ κύριε appears nowhere in the LXX as a response to a request or order. κύριε does appear as part of a deferential reply, and ἐγὼ as part of an expression of attention (Acts 9:10), but never of deferential obedience to a prior command. The parallel required is Sophocles, *Trachiniae*, 1247-1248.

[211] The fact that all uses of θέλω + οὐ/μὴ in Josephus are followed by or imply Infinitives clarifies the use here in 21:29 and in Mt 18:4. Note the uses in the Synoptics followed by an Infinitive: 22:3 No Par or Diff Lk; 23:37 Par Lk; 27:24 Diff Mk; Lk 13:34 Par Mt.

[212] p.375 n.114.

[213] The numeral δύο appears just before its Noun in the following MSS: B 142, 299, 544, 692, 1012, 1402, 1424, 1588, 1606, it vg Hil Aug. It appears earlier in 1555 at 4:21, and in second position, after the Noun, in W at 26:2. Otherwise the textual evidence is unanimous in placing the numeral before the Noun in every one of the Matthean examples of δύο, except 21:28. The B and minuscule reading can be explained by knowledge of the consistently maintained Matthean order or by the similar Lucan parable opening. If the numeral is read after the Noun, as seems best, despite the evidence from Luke that in various synoptic relationships both positions for the numeral can be used, then a source for Matthew's opening of the parable (pace Merkel) is probably to be posited.

[214] If τις is read, there may well be a case for arguing that Matthew is dependent on a source.

υἱός
Mt No Par 24x: 1:1,20,21,23,25; 2:15; 5:9; 9:27; 10:23; 12:23; 12:32; 13:37,38; 13:41; 17:25,26; 21:9,15; 23:15,31; 25:31; 27:9; 27:43; 28:19;
Par Mk 29x: 3:17; 8:29; 9:6,15; 12:8; 13:55; 16:27; 17:5; 17:9,12,15,22; 20:18; 20:20,28,30,31; 21:37,37; 22:42,45; 24:30,36; 26:24,24,45,63,64; 27:54;
Par Lk 16x: 4:3,6; 5:45; 7:9; 8:20; 11:19,27,27,27; 12:27,32,40; 24:27,37,39,44.
Diff Mk 11x: 14:33; 16:13; 16:16; 16:28; 20:21; 21:5; 21:38; 26:2,37; 27:40; 27:56.
Diff Lk 6x: 8:12; 10:37; 19:28; 22:2; 23:35; 24:39.
No Par or Diff Mk 15:22; 17:12;
No Par or Diff Lk 24:30.

[215] p.457.

of texts each represented by a major uncial: 1. B; 2. ℵ; 3. D; 4. Θ.[216] The third group, the Western text, has never been satisfactorily explained and several attempts have been made to reconstruct the original parable from it.[217] Michaelis reconstructs from the third group a parable of *The Regretful Son*,[218] arguing that previous attempts to understand the third group had not noted the lack of correspondence between the parable in 21:28-30 and the Interpretation in 21:31-32. The parable is about doing and saying, whereas the Interpretation contrasts the unbelief of Jewish leaders (as in 21:23-27; οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε in v25 and v32: why did you not believe John?) with the belief of publicans and harlots.

Michaelis also noted the ambiguity of three words in the text: μεταμελομαι 'regret' or 'repent'; 'go' or 'go off' (see 22:4); ὕστερον 'later' or 'too late', and the reading of the Latin minuscules c and e: "vos autem videntes paenitentiam habuistis postea, quod non credidistis ei." Behind this

---

[216] The variations of the parable are, in outline:

1. B	1st Son	I Lord and went not;	
	2nd Son	I do not want—	
		later changed his mind(?)	
		went off/left.	
	Who?	THE LAST (4,The second) see Co^{bo} r^2 $Aeth^{2codd}$ 346? 238.	
		ὕστερος 273.	ἔσχατος
2. ℵ	1st Son	I do not want—	
		later changed his mind(?)	
		went off.	
	2nd Son	I Lord and went not.	
	Who?	THE FIRST	
		Syr^{sin}	Same as 2. but THE LAST.
		Syr^{cur}	Same as 3. but THE FIRST.
3. D	1st Son	I do not want—	
		but later changed his mind(?)	
		and went into the vineyard.	
	2nd Son	Lord, I go	
		and he did not go (away?).	
	Who?	THE LAST	Read by a c d ff^2 h l
4. Θ	1st Son	I go	fam 13 (excl. 346)
		and did not go off	543. Syr^{hier} Co^{sa}
			Arm Geo
	2nd Son	I do not wish—	
		but later changed his mind(?)	
		and went (off?)	
	Who?	THE LAST	700. Arm fam 13; Geo^{A} The first.

[217] See Schmid, *Zwei Söhnen*, 68-84, who assumes three major groupings only. He prefers 1, and explains 2 as a corrected version of the impossible text 3, text 3 being the result of a failure to understand the relationship of the parable to the Matthean context.

[218] Michaels, *The Regretful Son*, 15-26; Richards, *Two Sons*, 5-14.

text, and the other variants, Michaelis conjectures an original Greek text: [ουδε] μετεμελήθητε ὕστερον τοῦ πιστεῦσαι αὐτῷ, meaning: (i) you repented later so as to believe him, or (ii) you regretted too late to believe him. The original parable, reflected in the Western text, would read:

> What do you think of this? A certain man had two sons. Coming to the first he said, 'My boy, go today and work in the vineyard'. But he answered and said, 'I will not'. Later he went away regretful. Coming to the second the father said the same thing. He answered and said, 'Aye, sir' and did not go away. Which of the two sons did the will of the father? They said 'The latter'. Jesus said to them, 'Truly I say to you that the publicans and harlots are entering the Kingdom instead of you. For John came to you in the way of righteousness and you did not believe him. And you, when you saw it, regretted too late because you did not believe him'.

Michaelis's method is useful, but is weakened by the fact that no extant MS reads his text of the parable. A better method is one which the present study of *The Tenants* has made possible, that of monitoring the pre-Matthean stage of the parable of *The Two Sons*. There are three pieces of evidence for monitoring that stage: 1) there is the evidence of a pre-Matthean form of *The Tenants*; 2) there is the interpretation of *The Two Sons* in 21:31c-32; and 3) there is the MS evidence. The pre-Matthean form of *The Tenants* contrasts, on the one hand, those who had expected the Kingdom but were rejected, with, on the other hand, those who had not expected the Kingdom but in fact received it, because they were righteous (21:43), a contrast presented in the context of a sequence of messengers, including John the Baptist, and Jesus Christ. The interpretation of *The Two Sons* has the same contrast and context: 'You, when you saw the reaction of sinners to John did not change your minds about him, when the last warning was given.' The distinctive note here is that the second opportunity for repentance was given, and this also was refused.

The question is therefore whether the MS evidence provides any indication of a form of the parable which would correspond to this meeting-point of the two other sources. It is important that the Western text uses the πρῶτος/ἔσχατος terminology, and concludes that the one who was ἔσχατος was to be preferred. A form of the parable which explains the development of the Western text would be one which highlights that feature. The following parable would do this and would also correspond to the other evidence of a pre-Matthean form:

> A man had two sons. He went to the first and said: 'Go and work in the vineyard.' He answered 'No' and went off. Later he repented. He came to the second and said the same. He replied, 'Yes lord', and did not go off. Which of the two did the father's will. They said, 'The last'.

The point of the parable in that form is that immediate obedience is better than a later change of heart, and it corresponds to both the other pieces of evidence, and especially with the interpretation of *The Two Sons,* since it gives particular point to 21:32c.

What happened to this form of parable? Why was it altered? The alteration is partly explained by noting the reference above to the righteous obtaining the Kingdom. 21:43 makes clear that the Kingdom will belong to those who produce the fruit of the Kingdom, whereas 21:32 makes no such demand on the publicans and harlots. This of course assumes that the text form of the parable as we have it in the current editions of Matthew is correct. It also carries with it the implication that the pre-Matthean form of the parable was well enough known for the earlier version to confuse the scribes as they were copying Matthew. It was probably an oral tradition which continued alongside the redaction of the Gospel and alongside the scribal copying of the Gospel. That is a hypothesis which provides a more adequate explanation of the complicated mass of evidence than Michaelis's suggestion can.

The value placed in Oriental circles on immediate obedience is noted by Derrett in his treatment of this parable,[219] quoting Ecclus 19:21. Derrett understands the parable as involving a younger brother who, although an instinctive rebel, with equally typical compliance eventually humiliates his older brother. Using this interpretation Derrett explains the alterations given in the textual tradition with regard to the order of the sons. Originally the elder brother stood for the chief priests, humiliated by the publicans and harlots. A scribe, argues Derrett, failed to see the importance of the relationships involved, and simply equated the outcasts with the elder brother who answered 'No' but thereafter changed his mind. There are however two difficulties with Derrett's solution. First, the Western text cannot be treated as it stands as a parable about instant obedience; and second, the terminology regarding the two brothers shows from its variety that the ancient scribes did not see that the two brothers were necessarily an elder brother and a younger brother.[220]

---

[219] Derrett, *Two Sons*, 109-116.

[220] A survey of πρῶτος in the Synoptics supports this judgment:

Mt	10:2	Diff Mk	Of Simon Peter as first of the apostles. Mk and Lk have no πρῶτος.
	12:45	Par Lk	Opposite to ἔσχατος (Lk 11:26). Of the state of person visited by 7 devils.
	17:27	No Par	τὸν ἀναβάντα πρῶτον ἰχθυν ἆρον. The first fish to come up.
	19:30	Par Mk	Opposite ἔσχατος; first/last: last/first (Mk 10:31; Lk 13:30).
	20:8	No Par	ἀπὸ τῶν ἐσχάτων ἕως τῶν πρώτων, i.e. all.

(iii) *The Tradition*

The relationship of the parable to Lk 7:29ff has been much discussed.[221] There is sufficient evidence of traditional material behind these verses for a Q-type topos to be posited, contrasting sinners and scribes in their attitudes to John the Baptist. A direct literary dependence of Mt 21:28-32 on the

	20:10	No Par	οἱ πρῶτοι i.e. the earliest in to work.
	20:16	No Par	=19:30.
	20:27	Par Mk	Opposite to δοῦλος (Mk 10:44).
	21:28	No Par	
	21:31?		
	21:36	Diff Mk	ἄλλους δούλους πλείονας τῶν πρώτων, i.e. former.
	22:25	Par Mk	The first of 7 brothers implies the eldest, but is in a numerical sequence (Mk 12:20; Lk 20:29).
	22:38	Par Mk	The first and great commandment (Mk 12:28f).
	26:17	Par Mk	The first day of unleavened bread (Mk 14:12; Matthew omits ἡμέρᾳ).
	27:64	No Par	ἐσχάτη πλάνη χείρων τῆς πρώτης.
Mk	6:21	> *	= semi-technical name for Galilean leading figures.
	9:35	>	Opposite to ἔσχατος and διάκονος.
	10:31	Par Mt	
	10:44	Par Mt	
	12:20	Par Mt	
	12:28	Par Mt	
	12:29	>	
	14:12	Par Mt	
	16:9	Text?	
Lk	2:2	No Par	αὕτη ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη.
	11:26	Par Mt	(Mt 12:45);
	13:30	Par Mk	(Mk 10:31 and Mt 19:30);
	14:18	Diff Mt	ὁ πρῶτος εἶπεν αὐτῷ. Of the guests invited to the Great Feast. Followed by ἕτερος.
	15:22	No Par	Parable of *The Prodigal*: the finest robe.
	16:5	No Par	Parable of *The Unjust Steward*. Of sequence.
	19:16	Diff Mt	Parable of *The Talents*. Of sequence.
	19:47	Diff Mk	οἱ πρῶτοι τοῦ λαοῦ.
	20:29	Par Mk	

The use of numerals is interesting, particularly where Luke uses πρῶτοι Diff Mt 2x. For this in the fables, see Aesop 300.11,15 (with ἕτερος), *Fab Synt.* 55:3 and Babrius, 18:4, using the classical πρότερος.

Thus the only evidence for πρῶτος as elder is the implication behind Mt 22:25 and its parallels. Since, in the other parables and fables, age is not necessarily implied, it is unsatisfactory to require this meaning for the Matthean form of *The Two Sons*.

[221] Jeremias, *Parables*, 80.

tradition in Lk 7:29ff is not likely,[222] but the development of an oral tradition incorporating such a topos is likely.

The contrast in Mt 21:32 recalls Romans 11:30-31: the contrast is between sinners who initially refused to be obedient but thereafter underwent a change of heart, and those who were rejected but thereafter were given a second chance of repentance (Mt 21:32). Whereas Mt 21:32c had considerable point in the pre-Matthean tradition, it is not so appropriate in the Matthean text. Presumably a viewpoint such as Rom 11:30-31 could have encouraged its retention. This would be particularly likely if the Jews found in Matthew's Gospel are representatives of those who could repent but do not, and need to be warned to do so. In that case, 21:32c was retained by Matthew not only on the principle of conserving tradition, but also because of an interest in the possibility of repentance for all. That Judas repented but killed himself (Mt 27:3) forms part of Matthew's insistent warning that the opportunity for repentance must be seized immediately.

The theme of 'requests to work a vineyard' is well attested in rabbinic tradition, and the plots offered there differ from the Matthean version. Exodus Rabba 27:9 (Yithro) concentrates on the responsibilities attending a commitment to work:

He called the fifth and asked him: 'Will you take over this field?' He replied: 'Yes.' 'On the condition that you will till it?' The reply was again 'Yes'. But as soon as he took possession of it, he let it lie fallow. With whom was the king angry? With those who declared: 'We cannot undertake it', or with him who did undertake it, but no sooner undertook it than left it lying fallow? Surely with him who undertook it.

The interpretation of this parable in its rabbinic context concerns Israel's commitment. It is followed by the parable of *Two Pieces of Cut Glass*, and by the two commitments in Ex 24:7: 'All that the Lord hath spoken we will do and obey.'

A recent conjecture by Scott[223] uses this rabbinic material to suggest how the parable of *The Two Sons* might have been used by Jesus of Nazareth. The issue in the rabbinic parables is the embarrassment of the king's honour. He has lost face because of them all, but most particularly because of the one who let the land lie fallow. Within the peasant world of Jesus, shame and honour were the primary issues. The child who says 'No!' but goes and the child who says 'Yes!' and does not go both bring shame and honour to their parent. The hearers can choose between them, but there is no

[222] Weder, *Gleichnisse*, 231 n.106; for the parallels between Matthew and Luke in the context of Lk 7:29, see Lambrecht, *Treasure*, 96.

[223] Scott, *Parable*, 79ff.

obvious logic for the decision. The Western text of the story made one choice: did it represent how Jesus concluded the story? Matthew's tradition, with its emphasis on actual obedience, took the other. The ambiguity of the story lingered on in the tradition, and it was this ambiguity which confused the copyists as they worked with the texts of Matthew.

These comparisons with rabbinic parallels underline how simplistic the judgment is that the parable of *The Two Sons* might have been created by Matthew as a Talmudic parable to fit this point[224] in his Gospel.

(iv–v) *The History of the Parables and the History of Redaction*

There is little doubt that this parable, as it stands in Matthew, is in the form of a classic rabbinic moral parable.[225] Originally it was probably akin to the Wisdom aphorisms used to stimulate personal reaction and responsibility. The level of narration and the level of interpretation are the same; both concern obedience and morality. But within the Matthean redactional context the parable operates differently. It has become a warning. It is parallel with Mt 7:24-27 and Mt 13:3-9, and warns the hearer to accept the heavenly authority of the Son. It is blindness and folly to reject it.

F. *The Feast* Mt 22:1-14/Lk 14:16-24

(i) *The Context*

The conclusion of the Marcan parable of *The Tenants* (Mk 12:12c) is delayed in Matthew until after *The Tribute* pericope (Mt 22:15-22).[226] That has the

---

224 Goulder, *Midrash*, 56.

225 Flusser, *Gleichnisse*, 149ff.

226 The significance of this delay in Matthew's introduction of Mk 12:12c is that it detaches the *Tribute* pericope from the other groups of Controversies and links the *Tribute* pericope with the *Authority* pericope (Mt 21:23-27) and with the three parables (21:28-32,33-46 and 22:1-14). This detaching of the *Tribute* pericope from the Controversies and the attaching of it to the group of parables deserves comment in two ways: first, the grouping of the parables in itself requires an explanation: perhaps it was a pre-Matthean collection; second, the *Authority* pericope concerns the parallel betwen the authority of Jesus and that of John the Baptist. In Mt 21:28f this is focussed in the requirement to fulfil the divine will. The *Authority* pericope concerns the authority of Jesus as the Son of God, and the *Tribute* pericope is so phrased as to make it a reflection of the *Temptation* of the Son of God in Mt 3:7-10. Thus the material brought together in 21:23–22:22 presents the authority of the Son of God, both as it is exhibited in the fuller obedience to God which he exemplifies, and as he helps others to fulfil it. The *Tribute* pericope relates to this specifically in that it makes clear that obedience belongs to God, and only to Caesar in so far as this expresses obedience to God. The Son's 'way of righteousness', like John the Baptist's, is

effect of giving the material a fresh focus: the fulfilment of the divine will revealed in his Son. The Marcan motif of Jesus as a prophet is inserted at the conclusion of *The Tenants* so that it comes between the parable of *The Tenants* and that of *The Feast* (Mt 21:46),[227] providing a further stress on the Son's authority. This relates the group of parables to the same motifs of obedience and authority. The Matthean parable of *The Feast* (22:1) provides evidence that there was a grouping of several parables at a pre-Matthean stage: every item in the verse,[228] including its curious word order, points to tradition rather than to Matthean editorial activity. A grouping of parables has been placed in this same focus.

(ii) *The Redaction*

The Lucan and Matthean parables of *The Feast* (Mt 22:1ff./Lk 14:16ff) each resemble Lk 14:7-14, but in different ways. The two parables in Lk 14:7-14 and 14:15-42 are about a feast for the poor, crippled, lame and blind; Matthew's parable is not. Lk 14:7-14 and Mt 22:1-14 share distinctive vocabulary not found in Lk 14:15-24, notably the words γάμοι and ἄριστον. A third word is common to all three parables: κεκλημένοι, and is found there only in the Synoptic Gospels (see however Rev 19:19). These relationships point to traditional material rather than to literary[229] or source connections.[230]

---

about doing God's will in the world, which, for all the world's agents and powers of evil, cannot imprison God's servants in fear. The realization of the divine will is possible in the world through the powers of the Kingdom.

[227] The concern of John the Baptist and Jesus with the fulfilment of the divine will is given the particular focus of 'prophecy' (Mt 21:26,46; see Mk 12:12c). On this, see Hill, *Prophecy*, 45; L'Epplattenier, *Matthieu 21/10–24/2*.

[228] (i) See p.381 on πάλιν. (ii) The position of αὐτοῖς is unusual. The only parallel to this word order is in Mt 13:13 Diff Mk, but here the context seems to require that αὐτοῖς alone goes with λέγων. Nowhere else in the synoptic tradition is this formula punctuated by πάλιν, and nowhere else does a modifying phrase appear in the formula between εἶπεν and αὐτοῖς. A similar phrase does appear in 13:34 (Diff Mk as far as word order is concerned) between the Verb of Speech and the Dative; but it is without λέγων. (iii) The Plural παραβολαῖς is elsewhere in Matthew explicable in terms of context (13:3,10,13,34,35,53; 21:45) but here it lacks an obvious explanation, as does the formula. To what is 22:1 the reply? (iv) The difficulties listed in (i–iii) were clearly problems for the scribal copyists. Textual variants appear throughout the formula. These could be evidence of an earlier grouping of parables, perhaps with 20:1-18 as the fourth of a series, ending the group with a vineyard parable, or with Mt 20:1-18 as part of triplet.

[229] (i) In Luke one Feast parable is followed by another, with close links between them (14:13; 14:21). The former is prefaced by the close scrutiny of the Pharisees (14:1-5) and followed by a section on discipleship (14:25-27), illustrated by two parables. All this material is without parallel in Matthew,

The Lucan and Matthean parables of *The Feast*[231] have a common outline and this, with the cluster of agreements in Mt 22:3-5/Lk 14:17-18 (see also 22:8-9/Lk 14:21), may well be best explained by the Q hypothesis, although opinion is divided on this point.[232] The Gospel of Thomas parable of *The Feast*[233] shares features of this common outline (e.g. the reference to excuses) but is probably independent of both Matthew and Luke.[234] Despite the common outline shared by these three versions the differences between them, in construction, vocabulary, interests and purpose, are very great.

Nine questions emerge from an analysis of the Matthean parable:
1) Mt 22:3 refers to the king, preparing a wedding for his son. Matthean material is particularly evident here. Did Matthew create it?
2) The number of messengers and occasions on which they were sent differ in Matthew from Luke. How are the versions related?
3) Mt 22:6-7 includes apparently inexplicable violence. Why?
4) Mt 22:8 refers to the original guests as unworthy. Is this connected with the motif in 21:43?
5) Is there a connection between Mt 22:10 and Mt 13:48f?
6) What is the significance of the 'wedding garment'?
7) What is the connection between Mt 8:12 and Mt 22:13?
8) Is there a difference between the δοῦλοι of 22:4,8 and 10 and the διάκονοι of 22:13?
9) Is Mt 22:14 relevant to this particular context?

---

except for Lk 14:25-27 Par Mt 10:37-38 and Lk 14:7-14 Par Mt 20:28 in the Western text. (ii) The distinctiveness of the Lucan section is illustrated by the Verb παρατηρέω used of the Pharisees, and only elsewhere in the Gospels at Lk 6:7, 14:1, 20:20, and Mk 3:2. The links between Lk 14:7-14 and Lk 14:15-24 are not on the whole shared with Mt 22:1-10, except for three words: κεκλημένοι, γάμοι and ἄριστον, the second and third of which are shared by Lk 14:8,12 with Mt 22:3-4: (a) κεκλημένοι In Mt only at 22:3,4,8; in Lk only at 14:7,8,17,24. (b) γάμοι Mt only in 22:2,3,4,9 in the Plural; 22:8,10?,11,12 in the Singular; 25:10 (see Lk 12:36) in the Plural; Lk only in 12:36 (see Mt 25:10); 14:8 No Par or Diff Mt (20:28 Western text). Elsewhere in the NT: 6x Singular. (c) ἄριστον Mt 22:4; Lk 11:38 No Par or Diff Mk; 14:12 (with δεῖπνον); see Jeremias, *Sprache*, 206. (iii) The two parables in Luke 14:7-14 and 14:15-24 are concerned with a Feast for the poor, the crippled, the lame and the blind; one was offered in generosity, the other because those invited refused to come. Sanders, *Banquet*, 259ff. The Matthean Feast concerns particularly those unworthy to share in the feast, who are therefore punished.

230 Hahn, *Einladung*, 74.

231 Harnack, *Sayings of Jesus*, 119.

232 Linnemann, *Mt 22,1-14*, 247, 253, speaks of Erzählungsvarianten; see Dormeyer, *Lukas 14, 15-24*, 206ff.

233 Palmer, *Married*, 241f n.234.

234 Hahn, *Einladung*, 60ff.

Each of these questions will be dealt with separately.

1) Did Matthew create Mt 22:3?

ὅστις introduces a synoptic parable only at 7:24,26 (Diff Lk), 13:52 (No Par), 21:33 (Diff Mk), 22:2 (Diff Lk) and 25:1 (No Par) (6x in all). ὁμοιώθη appears as first word in 13:24, 18:23 and 22:2:[235] ὁμοιώθη ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀνθρώπῳ appears in synoptic parables only at Mt 18:23ff, 22:2ff and 25:34ff, and Lk 14:31f. γάμοι has a place in late Wisdom literature,[236] and τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ is the only reference to the bridegroom in the parable, an inessential reference apparently (see 25:10).

An evaluation of these features of Mt 22:3 must take account of two factors: the detail associated with each usage and the distinctiveness of the Matthean overall usage.

(i) In the case of ὅστις, the proximity of 21:33 and 22:2 has to be noted; the two adjacent parables begin similarly. The likelihood of a pre-Matthean tradition behind 25:1 αἵτινες λαβοῦσαι should be given due weight. On the other hand, in 7:24,26 the detailed attempts to provide a pre-Matthean explanation of ὅστις were not successful. In any case, all six uses cannot simply be explained by the use of tradition.[237]

(ii) ὁμοιώθη belongs in 13:24 to a triplet of parables with similar introductions,[238] using the Aorist as against the Future in 7:24, 26 and 25:1 (and as against the Present in Mt 13:31 and 13:33).[239] The Passive form is found nowhere else in the Synoptic Gospels.

(iii) βασιλεύς has been seen in 25:31,34 and 40 to be part of tradition.[240] Over the whole of Matthew the interest in βασιλεία is strong and the development of 22:3 has to be seen in the light of that emphasis. The rabbinic main theme of king,[241] and the appearance of what Lüthi calls 'ein stumpfes Motiv' (e.g. υἱός in 22:3),[242] are a reminder that the distinctiveness of a parable has to be judged as much in the light of its general narrative tradition.

---

235 See p.177 n.4.

236 For the Noun in the Plural, see Wis 14:24,26; 13:17; also 1 Macc 9:37,41. For the Noun in the Singular, see Gen 29:22; Tob 6:12.

237 See p.175 n.3.

238 p.316 n.124.

239 The Future tenses in Lk 7:31; 13:18; 13:20 seem to be a literary technique to arouse interest. The Aorists may be gnomic (Black, *Aramaic*, 129) but it is better to describe them as Present Stative (Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 268, 280).

240 See pp. 236-238.

241 Flusser, *Gleichnisse*, 36ff.

242 Lüthi, *Pfund*, 6.

2) The number of messengers and the occasions on which they were sent differ in Matthew and Luke. How are the versions related?
In Matthew and Luke an initial invitation is rejected, and a subsequent invitation is successful.[243] In Matthew numerous servants are used, in Luke only one. The initial invitation is given in Matthew twice by different servants to the same invited guests.[244] The subsequent invitation is given by Luke by the same servant to two complementary groups of guests.[245] In Matthew the guests initially invited are divided into those who have alternative employment[246] and those whom ὕβρισαν καὶ ἀπέκτειναν (22:6).[247] These two Verbs recall 21:35;[248] the treatment of the slaves in both passages hints at the rejection of the prophets. This hint invites the question whether the development of the double initial invitation in Matthew 22:2-6 might belong to the same level of tradition as 21:35.[249] The development of the subsequent invitation in Luke[250] probably belongs to the stage at which the Feast parables in Lk 14:7-24 were joined. Although the two complementary groups in Lk 14:21 and 23 could be seen as part of a salvation-historical scheme,[251] that is not essential for the sense of the Lucan parable.[252]

3) Mt 22:6-7 includes apparently inexplicable violence. Why?
The violence toward the servants has been explained as a re-hearing of the tradition in the context of violent treatment meted out to the prophets. The response of the king picks up the anger of the Q parable,[253] and develops that by means of a literary topos identified by Rengstorf.[254] The parallel with *The Tenants* is close, especially in the early part of the topos (compare 22:7 and 21:41). But the burning of the city raises different issues: in *The Tenants* the vineyard is kept intact (contrast Isa 5:5-6); in *The Feast* the city is burnt.[255] The reference could be specific, to the burning of Jerusalem,[256]

---

243 Weder, *Gleichnisse*, 177 n.52.
244 Michaelis, *Kleid*, 11.
245 Glombitza, *Abendmahl*, 13.
246 Ballard, *Great Supper*, 345f.
247 Ballard, *Great Supper*, 349; Bertram, *TDNT*, 8.295ff.
248 See p.379; Hahn, *Einladung*, 55f.
249 Dillon, *Parables*, 10.
250 Jeremias, *Sprache*, 241.
251 Marshall, *Luke*, 585
252 Sanders, *Banquet*, 266-267.
253 See LXX of this Verb and kingship: e.g. Daniel Bel, 20.
254 Rengstorf, *Stadt*, 106ff.
255 Ballard, *Great Supper*, 349ff.
256 Linnemann, *Parables*, 164 n.17, for the view that the reference to Jerusalem in vv6f is a major objection to the unity of the parable as an original

or general, to the repressive activities of kings. In terms of the final redaction, probably the latter is correct.[257] Derrett interprets the royal wrath as a midrash on Zeph 1:1-16,[258] the Targum of which shows God inspecting his troops before the banquet and scrutinizing those who are suspect, so that the honours are shared by the loyal. The Targumic reference may well be relevant to 22:7 but it can hardly have created the structure of 22:2ff, where the double invitation to the same group contains a balance of responses[259] inappropriate to the midrash.[260]

It is of course possible to see 22:6-7 not as a fragment of tradition or a topos, but as part of an interlocking double narrative: two narratives are recorded which interlock at the point of 'rejection': in the first case the rejection of the city, in the second the rejection of the one without a wedding garment.[261] Unfortunately the two plots are not uniformly identifiable, so that whereas 22:6-7 creates an identifiable concluding context for the first narrative, the significance of the ending of the second narrative is far from clear, and the beginning of neither narrative is specific enough for the reader to grasp the distinctiveness of each. As a result the parable is naturally read as a single rather than a double plot.

4) Mt 22:8 refers to the original guests as unworthy. Is this connected with the motif in 21:43?

The Q version of the parable may be assumed to have included the 'replacement' motif, if the structure of initial and subsequent invitation belongs to Q. 22:8 makes this emphatic, on the ground that the guests were not ἄξιοι. The description οὐκ ἄξιοι (see 10:10 Par Lk and 10:11,13,13,38 Diff Lk; also Lk 7:4 Diff Mt) could belong to the final redaction of Q or to an earlier stage in the development of Q. It may well be the latter.[262] The

totality; for further discussion of this, see Vögtle, *Hochzeitsmahl*, 204ff; Weder, *Gleichnisse*, 181 n.71.

257 See Mt 20:25.

258 Derrett, *Great Supper*, 126ff.

259 Ballard, *Great Supper*, 344.

260 For the suggestion of Deuteronomic references in Luke, see Sanders, *Banquet*, 269 n.20. Sanders, *Banquet*, 270 n.35, Palmer, *Married*, 246, and Scott, *Parable*, 170, make the same criticism of Derrett, that he fails to deal with the Matthean and Lucan traditions within their 'history of tradition', preferring to create his own conflation of their traditions. For a possible reconstruction of an original parable implying, via a Deuteronomic allusion, the coming vengeance of God, see Scott, *Parable*, 173.

261 van Aarde, *God-with-us*, 240-247.

262 ἄξιος Schenk, *Sprache*, 33; Gundry, *Matthew*, 541; Neirynck, 216.

Mt 9x: 2x Par Lk; 4x Diff Lk; 3x No Par or Diff Lk

Lk 8x: 6x No Par; 2x Par Mt

fresh emphasis on the rejected guests, coupled with the reason for their rejection, that they killed the righteous prophets, brings the verse into close proximity to the 21:43 tradition. However, ἄξιος in the Q tradition is ambiguous; it means either 'deserving' or 'of quality', and that ambiguity is present in 22:8. It lacks the clarity of the judgment in 21:43, which requires that the newcomers should produce 'fruit'. One guest in *The Feast* indeed lacked the essential quality (22:11) and was rejected. The interests of 22:8 and 21:43 are therefore related in that they employ the replacement motif, but 21:43 is explicit on the issue of quality, whereas 22:8 is not.

5) Is there a connection between Mt 22:10 and Mt 13:48f?
The presence in the Matthean parable at 22:10 of πονηροὺς καὶ ἀγαθούς recalls the parable of *The Net*. The common factors are: the gathering of good and bad; the end of this ingathering (marked by the Verb ἐπληρώθη); and the subsequent separation of the good and the bad.[263] The first two elements are represented in the Lucan parable, although the vocabulary is different.[264] The third element is only found in Matthew, and only there in the 'wedding garment' section (vv11-14).

The phrase πονηροὺς καὶ ἀγαθούς may have another association, complementary to the above. In 5:45[265] it represents the totality of mankind under the providence of God, and the phrase in 22:10 therefore may indicate, as 25:31f also did, that the good news of the Kingdom concerns all. This may also be a stage in the development of the pre-Matthean replacement theme; to quote Vögtle:

Und die Wendungen 'welche ihr findet' (22:9) und 'all, die sie fanden, Böse und Gute' (22,10) weisen auf die Unterschiedlosigkeit und Universalität der Berufung, die an die Stelle der Berufung Israels tritt.[266]

See Trilling, *Hochzeitsmahl*, 258 n.16; Weiser, *Knechtsgleichnisse*, 62 n.20; Strecker, *Gerechtigkeit*, 192. For the relation of this Matthean text to the Lucan, the linking of vv5-7 with 9f by means of this word, and its absence from the parable's final scene in Matthew, see Hahn, *Einladung*, 57. The absence of the term from the remainder of the parable and its conclusion is important evidence for its traditional character in Mt 22:8. For its possible link with Esther 7:4 LXX, see Goulder, *Midrash*, 417 and n.287.

263 Hahn, *Einladung*, 77, is too hasty in associating this with redactional work on the basis of 5:45. In fact 5:45 is good evidence for its traditional character, as is the alternative distinction πονηρὸς/δίκαιος. So correctly, if indecisively, Weder, *Gleichnisse*, 182 n.72.

264 Hahn, *Einladung*, 58f.

265 The issue is once more of the relationship between 5:45, 13:36ff and 25:31ff. See Vaccari, *Festin de noces*, 133-135; Strecker, *Gerechtigkeit*, 218; also ch.5 p.334 n.207.

266 Vögtle, *Hochzeitsmahl*, 215; see also Meyer, *Called*, 95.

Within the parable the phrase in itself hints at the separation to follow, as is the case in 13:38f. To call them 'good and bad' is to build into the parable the warning characteristic of 13:48f and 13:36-43. Those who attend the feast should be warned of what is to follow. If for some among the hearers of the Matthean parable the warning carried Eucharistic association[267] and if the eschatological character of the corpus mixtum motif is emphasized, it is noteworthy that a distinctive feature in the Matthean Eucharistic Narrative is 'forgiveness of sins'.[268] There is time for amendment of life.

6) What is the significance of the 'wedding garment'?

The final section belongs to the main theme of a 'royal banquet'.[269] Under no other circumstances would an inspection of guests be appropriate. The garment could be an apocalyptic reference to the heavenly garment which apocalyptic expectation looked for in the world to come, and which could be forfeited here and now. The issue here is not whether or not the theme and the symbol are apocalyptic, but whether or not in Matthew they are still operating as elements of an apocalyptic world-view for the author and for the author's communities. It is of course important to distinguish the fact of unsuitability, as indicated by the loss of such a garment, from the cause of the unsuitability, as indicated by the behaviour or attitude which resulted in the loss.[270] But unless the apocalyptic world-view was a primary reference point for Matthew, the effect and the cause would have tended to fuse. The garment would not be symbolic of 'repentance'[271] or 'justification'[272] or 'good works'.[273] The Matthean association of the 'King', 'Kingdom' and 'righteousness' would make the latter particularly fitting, especially in view of the parallels between this parable and 21:43.

The evidence for Matthean authorship of the link passage 22:11-12 is not strong[274] and there are signs of pre-Matthean material.[275] This is true of the

---

[267] On the use of ἀξίως/ἀναξίως in relation to the Eucharist, see Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 202. This association is seldom considered despite the power of the basic imagery (see Jeremias, *Weltvollender*, 74f). The relationship of discipline to sacramental practice is hinted at in 1 Cor 11:27. Funk, *Great Supper*, 163-170, although he refers to sacramental matters, fails to do justice to these aspects of early Christian practice.

[268] See the Matthean addition in Mt 26:27 Diff Mk.

[269] Derrett, *Great Supper*, 142f; Swaeles, *Festin nuptial*, 680-682.

[270] Sim, *Dependence*, 17.

[271] Michaelis, *Kleid*, 66-68.

[272] Schniewind, *Matthäus*, 221f.

[273] Trilling, *Hochzeitsmahl*, 259ff; see also Sim, *Wedding Garment.*

[274] Goulder quotes ἔνδυμα as Matthean, and ἀνακεῖμαι, δεῦτε, ἐκεῖ, ἑταῖρε θεάομαι and ὧδε as semi-Matthean (see also Catchpole, *Q*, 38):

1) ἔνδυμα Schenk, *Sprache*, 154; Gundry, *Matthew*, 643; Neirynck, 248.

Mt 7x: 4x No Par; 1x Par Lk; 1x No Par or Diff Mk; 1x Diff Lk

Lk 1x: 1x Par Mt

With ἔχω 1x No Par; 1x Diff Mk. The movement from Noun to Verb or vice versa is illustrated by Mt 7:15 and Justin, *Dialogue* 35:3. See also Mk 6:9 Diff Mt.

ἐνδύω Schenk, *Sprache*, 155; Gundry, *Matthew*, 647; Neirynck, 248.

Mt 4x: 1x No Par; 1x Par Mk; 1x Par Lk; 1x Text?
Mk 3x: 1x Par Mt; 1x Diff Mt; 1x >*Mt
Lk 4x: 2x No Par; 1x Diff Mk; 1x Par Mt

2) ἀνάκειμαι Schenk, *Sprache*, 55; Gundry, Matthew, 641; Neirynck, 213.

Mt 5x: 1x Par Mk; 2x Diff Mk (κατάκειμαι); 2x No Par or Diff Lk
Mk 3x: 1x Par Mt; 1x Diff Mt (συνανάκειμαι); 1x Text?
Lk 2x: 2x No Par

κατάκειμαι

Mk 4x: 4x Diff Mt; (2x Diff βεβλημένος; 1x ἀνάκειμαι)
Lk 3x: 1x No Par; 2x Diff Mk

συνανάκειμαι

Mt 2x: 2x Par Mk
Mk 2x: 2x Par Mt
Lk 3x: 3x No Par

3) See p.256 n.269.

4) ἐκεῖ Schenk, *Sprache* 269; Gundry, *Matthew*, 644; Neirynck, 255.

Mt 28x: 12x No Par; 2x Par Mk; 4x Par Lk; 9x Diff Mk; 1x Diff Lk
Mk 11x: 2x Par Mt; 2x Diff Mt; 2x >*Mt; 4x > ; 1x Text?
Lk 16x: 4x No Par; 4x Par Mk; 4x Par Mt; 2x Diff Mk; 2x Diff Mt

Of the Mt 9x Diff Mk 3x ἐκεῖ + εἰμί;
1x τῶν ἐκεῖ ἑστηκότων;
1x ἐκεῖσε (= ἀπέρχομαι).
Six are clustered in 26:36–27:61.

Of the Mt 28x 2x are Par Mk; of Mk 11x, 8x are Diff Mt or >Mt.

5) ἑταῖρε Mt 4x: 2x No Par; 1x No Par or Diff Mk; 1x Text?

The significant factors are:

(i) The ironic use of the Vocative appears 3x: in the parables 20:12 and 22:12, and the Judas narrative (Senior, *Passion*, 125). This is a further example of vocabulary links between chs. 20-25 and the Passion Narrative (see Brown, *Death*, 256, on the implied ironic reproach in all three uses, and the two Old Testament parallels in 2 Sam 15 as part of the Ahitophel Passion background, and in Sir 37:2 in a lament over treachery).

(ii) Judged by the criteria of MS families, there is little doubt that ετερος should be read in Mt 11:16. This is an example of where strict editorial judgment might give the preference to εταιρος. The argument of this book would suggest that it is unwise to overrule the text-critical canons. Even if εταιρος were read in Mt 11:16, it would not be parallel to the ironic use of 20:13, 22:12 and 26:50.

6) θεάομαι

Schenk, *Sprache*, 393; Gundry, *Matthew*, 644; Neirynck, *Vocabulary*, 259.

Mt 4x: 3x No Par; 1x Par Lk
Mk 2x: 2x Text? (Mk 16:11,14)
Lk 3x: 1x No Par; 1x Par Mt; 1x Diff Mk (εἶδεν)

7) ὧδε Schenk, *Sprache*, 465; Gundry, *Matthew*, 649; Neirynck, 333.

Mt 18x: 2x No Par; 6x Par Mk; 2x Par Lk; 8x Diff Mk; 1x Diff Lk
Mk 10x: 6x Par Mt; 1x Diff Mt (αὐτοῦ); 3x >*Mt

whole section 22:2-12,[276] which shows no stylistic evidence of a break at 22:10.[277] The style of the whole parable is that of an epic parable, in three sections but without any balancing features between the sections.[278] The style is Greek, as (for example) is evident in the use of κρατέω in 22:6.[279]

7) What is the connection between 8:12 and 22:13?
The replacement motif is found in Mt 12:41f/Lk 11:31f and Mt 8:11f/Lk 13:28f. These two latter passages, Mt 8:12/Lk 13:28, also share the logion:[280] καὶ ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων. The context also implies the eschatological banquet: ἀνακλιθήσονται. This could point towards an early interpretation of the parable of *The Feast*, i.e. that it concerned the invitation to the eschatological banquet which some rejected and others accepted. The Q tradition took this to involve an unexpected interchange, the 'replacement motif' involving the sons of the Kingdom

---

Lk 16x: 8x No Par; 2x Par Mk; 2x Par Mt; 2x Diff Mt; 1x Diff Mk; 1x Text?

Of the Mt 8x Diff Mk, there are 3x μοι ὧδε.

The use with εἰσέρχομαι=hither is rare in the Gospels: see Mt 8:29 and 14:21; also with the Imperative, 14:8,18;17:7. But note also Mk 11:3 >*Mt and Mt 17:17 Diff Mk Par Lk 9:41 (an 'accidental' agreement, according to Schenk; but does not the accident depend on a common pattern of linguistic expression?).

A safe conclusion would be that in (3) without question, in (2), (6) and (7) in all probability, and perhaps in (1), (4), (5) and (7) Goulder's judgment is unreliable.

[275] Vögtle, *Hochzeitsmahl*, 204-215.

[276] Mt 22:3 illustrates this excellently. It overlaps with Lk 14:17: Schulz, *Q*, 394 n.127. The elements distinctive to each Gospel are probably traditional: Merriman, *Matthew xxii, 1-14*, 61.

ἤδη Schenk, *Sprache*, 276; Gundry, *Matthew*, 644; Neirynck, 257.

Mt 7x: 1x No Par; 3x Par Mk; 1x Par Lk; 2x Diff Mk
Mk 8x: 3x Par Mt; 2x >*; 3x >
Lk 10x: 3x No Par; 1x Par Mk; 2x Diff Mk; 1x Par Mt; 2x Diff Mt; 1x No Par or Diff Mk

ἕτοιμος Schenk, *Sprache*, 264; Neirynck, 254.

Mt 4x: 2x No Par; 2x Par Lk
Mk 1x: 1x >
Lk 3x: 1x No Par; 2x Par Mt

[277] The absence of a parallel to the Lucan conclusion (Lk 14:24), the vocabulary links of vv10 and 11, the incompleteness of the narrative in view of the judgment implied in πονηρούς τε καὶ ἀγαθούς, and the parallel with *The Net* all require a continuity inclusive of vv10 and 11f.

[278] On the term 'epic', see pp.422-424.

[279] The evidence on κρατέω suggests that the use of an object common to κρατέω and another Verb is found in all traditions of the Synoptic Gospels.

[280] See Rohde, *Teaching*, 246.

who are rejected and those who come from the east and the west who take their place at table.

The appearance of Mt 8:12bc in its distinctively Matthean form, as part of the conclusion of the parable of *The Feast*, suggests that the ending may not be separable from 22:5-8 and 10,[281] and that the introduction of the wedding garment is intended to give the replacement motif a more explicitly moral character. The wedding garment is not an optional extra in the parabolic narrative; it is an integral feature of that stage of the parable's history.

8) Is there a difference between the δοῦλοι of 22:4,8 and 10 and the διάκονοι of 22:13?

The δοῦλοι in Mt 22:6 can be recognized as parallel to the prophets; in 22:3 there is probably no precise correspondence to be expected. 22:10 probably picks up the opportunity given to sinners to repent (see 21:32). The precise correspondences worked out for v10 have been largely unsuccessful.[282] The διάκονοι in 22:13 are presumably so designated because they serve at table. But it is not at all clear how the designations should be understood. The differences of designation in *The Feast* correspond to the differences of designation in Mt 13:24-30, where the δοῦλοι operate in the early stages of the parable and the θερισταὶ at the end.

9) Is Mt 22:14 relevant?

The epigram appears here and in some MSS at the conclusion of the parable of *The Workers*. As a conclusion to 22:1-13 it refers to the many guests invited (κεκλημένοι, κλητοί) and the few who satisfy the king's review (ὀλίγοι see 7:14) and are chosen (ἐκλεκτοί). Mt 24:31/Mk 13:27 illustrates the apocalyptic role of ἐκλεκτοί. The Holy War context proposed by Derrett fits the epigram admirably, since the logion recalls the choice of the few by which divine victory was won.[283] The resonances of 22:14 would be heard even without the war topos in 22:7. Reading through from 22:7 to the end of the parable, the Holy War resonances are strong.

In conclusion, the Matthean parable of *The Feast* is based on the Q 'replacement' motif, associated with a sequence of messengers warning of the Last Judgment. In the parable the replacements are treated as morally suitable; the king summons them to his son's wedding and then reviews his guests. It is the final banquet and those unworthy are punished. The history of the parable is therefore parallel to the pre-Matthean stages of the parables of *The Two Sons* and *The Tenants*. It presents the same moral emphasis found in 21:43, and the same note of judgment (see the concluding parable

281 See the inner connections noted by van Tilborg, *Jewish Leaders*, 62f.
282 Weiser, *Knechtsgleichnisse*, 64ff.
283 Derrett, *Great Supper*, 143f.

of each of the ch. 13 triplets). The Matthean redaction consists in shaping the unit to make it an authoritative judgment on the disobedient and the fruitless, and to celebrate the one who takes up into his Sonship the prophetic and davidic roles.

(iii) *The Redaction*

The parable goes back to a feast parable used by Jesus to promise the Kingdom to the poor, the excluded and the sinful, or to warn those who expect a share in the Kingdom, or to subvert the ancient system of honour.[284] The feast theme gathered to it, as it did at Qumran, the associations of a messianic banquet, including the admission terms and the excuse motif from Deut 20.[285] This last feature dominated the later stages of the parable's history, as GThom 64 illustrates.

Rabbinic parables also adapted the banquet theme, associating it with the king theme, and incorporating wedding-garment sub-motifs.

It is like a king who invited his servants to the banquet and did not name the exact time. The wise among them came and sat at the door of the palace, saying 'Does the king's palace lack for anything?' But the fools went about their business, saying, 'Was there ever a banquet without a set hour?' All of a sudden the king summoned them to his presence. The wise ones appeared all dressed and cleaned up for the occasion, while the fools appeared in their dirt. The king rejoiced to see the wise ones and was angered at the appearance of the fools, and said: 'Those who have dressed themselves for the banquet, let them sit and eat and drink, while the ones who are unprepared may stand by and look at them.'[286]

Neusner treats the parable as a comment on Eccles 9:8: 'Let your garments be always white', interpreted by Yohanan ben Zakkai's pupil Eliezer as commending 'patience at all times, as if today were your last', perhaps with Yohanan himself commending good deeds and study of the Law (Qoh R 9:8) in the light of the joy awaiting the faithful in heaven:

Happy are you, and happy is she that bore you. Happy are my eyes that have seen this vision. Moreover, in my dreams you and I were reclining on Mount Sinai when a heavenly echo was sent to us saying, 'Ascend thither! Ascend thither! Here are great banqueting chambers and fine dining couches prepared for you. You and your disciples, and your disciples' disciples are designated for the third level of heaven'.

---

284 Marshall, *Luke*, 586.
285 Sanders, *Banquet*, 262ff.
286 bShab 153a; see Neusner, *Yohanan*, 239.

This parable sharpens our perception of some of the characteristics of the Matthean version. The Matthean parable lacks the 'wise/foolish' distinction; a solitary individual acts as representative of the fools. The Matthean *Feast* relates to its level of interpretation in the same way as the rabbinic parable does, although not in precisely the same way, because the 'wise/foolish' contrast is written into the structure of the rabbinic story. In both, the narrative is epic in style, with main themes and variable sub-motifs, both with symbolic and metaphorical features. In both, the level of interpretation is different from that of the narration, but the former level is hinted at throughout the story by means of the narration, its style and its rhetorical features. However, the rabbinic balanced form, concentrating attention on the 'wise/foolish' distinction, as Mt 7:24-27 does, is designed to focus on the issue of 'good deeds' as the preparation for 'the joy of heaven', while the Matthean was dependent on an earlier Jesus tradition, and shows a progressive development toward incorporating 'good deeds' into the narrative. It is true that comparisons between synoptic and individual rabbinic parables are always dangerous. In the case of the parable of *The Feast* they have led to a number of false judgments.[287] But in this example the comparison has served to make us more aware of the distinctive character of the Matthean narrative, of its uneven content yet uniform style. That is not to say that some rabbinic parables do not show exactly the same features. It is simply to point out the particular characteristics of 22:1-14.

The imagery of the marriage feast has already been seen in its various transformations, from apocalyptic joy to that judgment for which the feast is an essential preparation. In Mt 22:1-14, as in Rev 19:9, there is no mention of the bride, only of the guests and the bridegroom, and Batey ascribes this in part to the sober state of preparation for the great day for which Matthew asks so urgently.[288] Chrysostom in Homily 49:1-3 has the same emphasis: 'Since it is God's marriage feast that we are to attend, our clothes should be appropriate; but it is those who wear "garments of hair", leaving cities and homes for the life of holiness, who will be appropriately dressed for the day.'

The eucharistic imagery in Matthew concentrates on the merciful provision made by Christ (14:13-21; 15:32-39). By it his revelation is symbolized. The affirmation of the disciples' place with him in his Father's Kingdom is given in the record of the Institution (see 26:29 Diff Mk and Diff Lk), and this, together with the reference to the forgiveness of sins (26:28),[289] gives the celebration of the eucharistic meal an eschatological hope and joy which balances the sombre picture of 22:11-14.

---

287 Haenchen, *Grossen Mahl*, 151-155.
288 Batey, *Nuptial Imagery*, 59ff.
289 See n.266 above.

A 'lectionary' interpretation of *The Feast* sees the parable as a Christian version of the Esther story, fulfilling the feast of Purim, the feast following Zakor on the 14th Adar. But the readings for Purim were disputed among the second-century Tannaim, and the origin of the Feast, and of the Day of Nikanor, is too uncertain to provide a secure background for the parable.[290]

(iv–v) *The History of the Parables and the History of Redaction*
The history of the parable of *The Feast* shows how a basic form, expressing an early 'replacement' motif, was extended at key points and adapted to meet the moral concerns of a new context. It illustrates further the triple grouping of Marcan and Q-type material, and the use of the extended epic. One feature of this extended epic is that the figurative language within the parable moves with great speed from one key image to another, giving an uneven impression to the narrative. The parable relates to several different traditional areas, in some cases employing complementary aspects from them. The redactor did not seem to envisage the parable being used in isolation from the rest of the Gospel tradition. It is firmly embedded within the Matthean context. The parallel redaction in ch. 13 and in chs. 21-22, and the parallel stage of material used in both, raise important questions about the redactor's method. But the redactor's main concern is clear: the recurrent emphasis on the 'replacement' motif, on its unexpected elements, brings together *The Feast* and its context, narrowly and widely defined, so that the contrast is made between those who might expect a place in the Kingdom (the wise, the powerful, the overconfident, the leaders) and those who are to receive it (the children, the poor, the humble, the obedient).

G. *The Workers* Mt 20:1-16

(i) *The Context*
This is the first of the three vineyard parables, sharing with the other two common vocabulary, ὡσαύτως, ἀπῆλθεν and ὑπάγε[τε],[291] as well as the

[290] Goulder, *Calendar*, 291. Among the questionable assumptions made are:
1) that because Purim was celebrated in the time of Matthew, Esther would automatically be the lectionary read: see Bloch, *Jewish Holy Days*, 88ff; and Megillah 19a.
2) that references would be to the LXX text;
3) that Matthew was using Esther in view of the late date of the canonization of Esther under Rabbi Gamaliel II and its purpose in publicizing a miracle.
4) that all the key elements said to have been drawn from Esther necessarily came from there: see ἄριστον.

[291] On ὡσαύτως, see p.380 n.144; on ἀπῆλθεν, see p.295 n.48, and p.391 n.201.

common imagery of the vineyard and common introductory features. Some of the latter are common to other Matthean parables apart from the three vineyard parables. There is also a major distinction between 20:1ff and the other vineyard parables: the use of βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν (20:1).[292] The introduction, including βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, is shared with *The Feast* 22:2, along with the characteristically ironic use of ἑταῖρε,[293] [ἐξ]ῆλθεν and the Aorist Infinitive of Purpose, as well as stock traditional formulations.

Matthew is following Mark closely in this section.[294] The so-called community discourse concerned little ones and humility,[295] the submission of the self to the divine will. Ch. 19 began with a halakhic version of Mk 10:1-12 concerning divorce and bigamy, and further halakhah on marriage (19:10-12),[296] and the unmarried in relation to the Kingdom of Heaven. The apothegm regarding children as constituents of the Kingdom (19:13-15) is retained as an echo of 18:1-4, and introduces Mt 19:16-30, a re-drafted version of *The Rich Young Man*. This deals with the difficulties for the wealthy in fulfilling the whole Law and entering the Kingdom[297] (see the κάμηλος saying 19:24).[298] Its sequel is Peter's question regarding the rewards of following Jesus, answered by the Q saying, Mt 19:28. The reward of a heavenly throne is an inheritance (κληρονομήσει 19:29) to be received in the next life (λήμψεται 19:29) as a reward for leaving home and property now (Mt 19:29/Mk 10:29). The chapter ends with the epigram πολλοὶ δὲ ἔσονται πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι καὶ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι (Mt 19:30/Mk 10:31), which could mean a reversal of status, a levelling of status, either in general or specifically in relation to the expectation of rewards.

After the parable of *The Workers* the context again follows Mark. It concerns the fate and victory of the Son of Man (Mt 20:17-19), and the sharing of this victory only by those who are prepared to share his fate and follow the Father's will (*The Sons of Zebedee*, Mt 20:20-28). This involves an attitude to greatness totally opposite to that practised by kings (Mt 20:25; see the position of the child in 18:1-4). It calls for the attitude of the servant, exemplified in the compassion of Jesus (Mt 20:29-34).

---

[292] See Carter, *Households*, ch. 6.

[293] On ἑταῖρε, see p.407 n.274 (5), also Dietzfelbinger, *Weinberg*, 127; on ἐξῆλθεν, see p.292 n.46.

[294] See p.211.

[295] See pp.156-157.

[296] Moloney, *Celibacy*.

[297] Cope, *Matthew*, 111ff.

[298] Michel, *TDNT*, 3.592-594.

(ii) *The Redaction*

Goulder[299] gives the following list as Matthean and semi-Matthean phrases: ἀποδίδωμι,[300] μισθός,[301] ἀπὸ...ἕως,[302] ἀγαθός/πονηρός,[303] Aorist

---

[299] Goulder, *Midrash*, 417.

[300] ἀποδίδωμι Schenk, *Sprache*, 37; Gundry, *Matthew*, 642.

Mt 18x: 14x No Par; 1x Par Mk; 2x Diff Mk; 1x Par Lk
Mk 1x: 1x Par Mt
Lk 8x: 5x No Par; 1x Par Mk; 1x Diff Mk; 1x Par Mt

ἀποδίδωμι can be classified by its varied senses:

1)	Mt Par Lk	pay off	1x
2)	Mt No Par	fulfil (of oat)	1x
3)	Mt No Par	reward (absolute; positive)	3x; see 2 Tim 4:8.
4)	Mt No Par	pay (of wage, Mt 20:8)	1x
5)	Mt Par Mk Mk Par Mt Lk Par Mk	render (of tax)	1x
		See also Rom 13:7; 1 Cor 7:3 (of debt); Rev 22:12.	
6)	Mt Diff Mk	give over (of body)	1x
7)	Mt No Par	recompense (absolute; positive or negative)	2x?
	Mt Diff Mk	recompense	1x
		See also Rom 2:6; 2 Tim 4:14.	
8)	Lk No Par	give back (not financial)	1x
	Lk Diff Mk		1x
9)	Mt No Par	repay, give back (financial)	7x
		The Unforgiving Servant	
Lk	No Par	The Good Samaritan	2x
Lk	Diff Mk	Lk 7:42 μὴ ἐχόντων αὐτῶν ἀποδοῦναι	1x
See figurative uses in Rom 12:17; 1 Thess 5:15; 1 Pet 3:9; Rev 18:6.			
10)	Lk No Par	give account, explain	
		See also Acts 19:40; 1 Pet 4:5; Heb 13:17.	
11)	Acts 4:33	with 'witness'	
12)	Acts 5:8; 7:9	sell	
13)	Heb 12:11; Rev 22:2	yield	

These translations are a safer guide to distribution of the Verb-uses within its word field than Schenk's categories. Schenk classifies 20:8 among those uses of the Verb which have God as subject, despite the numerical strength of the financial uses of ἀποδίδωμι, and their numerical strength in parabolic material. Whilst this classification of 20:8 might just be possible in the light of 19:27, and with it the interpretation of μισθός as 'eternal life', the tautness of the narrative does not encourage detailed allegory, and the restriction of μισθός to 'personal immortality' is less probable, as the following note indicates. There is a lack of correspondence between the 'wages' of the parable and the compensation of 19:29 (Lambrecht, *Treasure*, 83).

[301] μισθός Schenk, *Sprache*, 364; Gundry, *Matthew*, 646.

Mt 10x: 7x No Par; 1x Par Mk; 1x Par Lk; 1x Diff Lk
Mk 1x: 1x Par Mt
Lk 3x: 1x No Par; 1x Par Mk; 1x Diff Mt

μισθόομαι
Mt 2x: 2x No Par

Participles,[304] οἰκοδεσπότης,[305] ἐργάτης,[306] ἑστώς,[307] ἐλθών,[308] ἀργός[309] δίκαιος,[310] κατὰ + Genitive,[311] νομίζω,[312] ἀποκριθείς,[313]

Schenk's view that Matthew's conception of 'reward' is purely eschatological would be highly questionable if 10:41 means 'the reward a prophet brings'. Although Mt 19:29 Diff Mk 10:29 does not use the word μισθός, Schenk invokes that passage also and it is important to observe that in it Matthew could be adding the inheritance of eternal life as a further future blessing, additional to a manifold present compensation for loss. As for Mt 10:10, there is no evidence that Matthew avoided Luke's use of μισθός in 10:7; there is however evidence that Matthew used μισθός with a present reference where Luke's parallel has χάρις (Mt 5:46/ Lk 6:32). So it is not possible to fit the usage of Noun and Verb into a single unchanging pattern; to attempt that produces strain at many points, not least in Mt 20:1-16. This difficulty reflects unfavourably also on Schenk's treatment of ἐργάτης (see n.306 below). See De Ru, *Reward*.

[302] ἀπὸ...ἕως Schenk, *Sprache*, 36; Gundry, *Matthew*, 42.
Mt 9x: 4x No Par; 3x Par Mk; 1x Par Lk; 1x Diff Lk
Mk 3x: 3x Par Mt
Lk 2x: 1x No Par; 1x Par Mt
The phrase can be part of a longer construction with ἄρχομαι;
Mt 1x: 1x No Par
Lk 1x: 1x No Par (Jeremias, *Sprache*, 301).
Schenk gives only the temporal uses and regards them as Matthean correspondence markers. 20:8 however marks a reversed order (De Ru, *Reward*, 205); there is a sovereign goodness (Hoppe, *Gleichnis*, 16) which surpasses all calculation and affirms the community's interdependence (Schottroff, *Solidarity*).

[303] On ἀγαθός, πονηρός, see p.306 n.90.

[304] On Aorist Participles, see p.274 n.332 (iv).

[305] On οἰκοδεσπότης, see p.202 n.98.

[306] ἐργάτης Schenk, *Sprache*, 390; Gundry, *Matthew*, 646.
Mt 6x: 3x No Par; 3x Par Mt
Lk 4x: 3x Par Mt; 1x Diff Mt (Mt ἐργαζόμενοι)
ἐργάζομαι
Mt 4x: 1x No Par; 1x Par Mk; 2x Diff Lk
Mk 1x: 1x Par Mt
Lk 1x: 1x No Par
ἔργον
Mt 6x: 3x No Par; 1x Par Mk; 2x Diff Lk
Mk 2x: 1x Par Mt; 1x Diff Mt
Lk 2x: 2x No Par

[307] ἑστώς On ἵστημι, see p.253 n.261. For the Perfect Participle:
Mt 7x: 3x No Par; 2x Par Mk; 2x Diff Mk
Mk 4x: 2x Par Mt; 1x Diff Mt; 1x > Mt
Lk 4x: 3x No Par; 1x Par Mk

The short form of the Perfect Participle is found as follows:
Mt 6x: 3x No Par 6:5; 20:3,6.
3x Diff Mk 16:28 (The Marcan reading has affected the

transmission of the text here);
24:15 (Note also the change to the Neuter);
26:73 (Mk has παρεστῶτες).

In Mt 27:47 the longer form is read by ℵBCL?Θ 124.33.700.892.1295.1555. The other uncials read the shorter form.

Mk 3x:	2x Par Mt:	In Mk 9:1 the shorter form is read by ℵ 33.357; In Mk 13:14 the MS evidence is very divided;
	1x > Mt:	In Mk 11:5 the minuscules are evenly divided between shorter and longer forms.
Lk 4x:	3x No Par:	In 5:1,2 and 18:13 the short form is used;
	1x Par Mk:	The longer form is used.

Matthew's retention of the longer form in Mt 27:47, Mark's use of the shorter form of the Compound Verb in Mk 14:70, and the evidence of a movement toward a shorter form in the MS tradition and in Luke, may mean that the use of the shorter form in Matthew reflects a synoptic development.

[308] On ἐλθών, see p.333 n.204.

[309] ἀργός

Mt 3x: 3x No Par: Mt 20:3,6 and Mt 12:36 a rhetorical context.

The other NT uses are: 1 Tim 5:13, Titus 1:12 = idle, i.e. unoccupied;
Jas 2:20, 2 Pet 1:8 = ineffective.

Derrett, *Workers*, 57, 70, treats the Adjective as the equivalent of the Jewish term for 'unemployed', and as meaning 'not compromised', of Gentiles avoiding heathen worship. See also Weder, *Gleichnisse*, 221 nn.54-55; Schenke, *Weinberg*, 258; Beavis, *Slavery*, 54.

[310] On δίκαιος and its secular sense in Mt 20, see Przybylski, *Righteousness*, 101, 104.

[311] κατὰ + Genitive

(i) = against

Mt 14x: 3x No Par; 2x Par Mk; 4x Diff Mk; 1x Par Lk; 4x Diff Lk
Mk 6x: 2x Par Mt; 1x Diff Mt; 1x >*Mt; 1x > Mt; 1x > (Par Lk)
Lk 3x: 1x No Par; 1x Par Mk; 1x Par Mt

(ii) = down

Mt 1x: 1x Par Mk
Mk 1x: 1x Par Mt
Lk 1x: 1x Par Mk

(iii) = by

Mt 1x: 1x Diff Mk

(iv) = up and down

Lk 2x: 2x No Par

This example illustrates well the difficulties in earlier methods of tabulation, such as those used by Goulder, *Midrash*. It also illustrates the possibility that formulae may have developed among the κατὰ + Genitive phrases in the Marcan and Q traditions.

[312] νομίζω Schenk, *Sprache*, 366; Gundry, *Matthew*, 646.

Mt 3x: 2x No Par; 1x Diff Lk (δοκεῖτε...ὅτι)
Lk 2x: 2x No Par

εἶπεν,[314] ἐκεῖνος[315] ἔσχατος,[316] συμφωνέω,[317] οὐχί,[318] ὀφθαλμὸς πονηρός,[319] λέγοντες,[320] λέγουσι, λέγει.[321] Statistical analysis suggests a strong traditional element in the list.

To the list may be added the probably non-Matthean evidence: ἅμα πρωΐ (20:1),[322] περὶ + Accusative (of time),[323] the Papyri and Hellenistic

---

δοκεῖτε...ὅτι
Mt 2x: 2x No Par
Mk 1x: 1x Diff Mt
Lk 4x: 3x No Par; 1x Diff Mt
Schenk views 20:10 in the light of 5:17 and 10:34; however, in 20:11 νομίζω means 'anticipated' and not necessarily 'falsely assumed', which would be a meaning out of character with a narrative which moves step by step.

313 On ἀποκριθείς, see p.335 n.214 (2).

314 Also on εἶπεν, see p.335 n.214 (1).

315 On ἐκεῖνος, see:
Schenk, *Sprache*, 390; Neirynck, *Vocabulary*, 244; Gundry, *Matthew*, 646.
As a Demonstrative Pronoun it is found:
Mt 4x: 2x No Par (Mt 17:27; 20:4); 1x Par Mk (Mt 13:11)
1x Diff Lk (Mt 24:43, Lk τοῦτο)
Mk 3x: 1x Par Mt; 2x Diff Mt (1x Mt κἀκεῖνα; see Mt 23:23); 3x Text?
Lk 4x: 3x No Par (Lk 12:38; 18:14; 19:4); 1x Diff Mk (Lk 8:32)

In general use it is found:
Mt 53x: 18x No Par; 8x Par Mk; 16x Diff Mk; 8x Par Lk; 3x Diff Lk
Mk 14x: 8x Par Mt; 1x Diff Mt; 5x >*Mt
Lk 33x: 19x No Par; 4x Par Mk; 8x Par Mt; 1x Diff Mk; 1x >*Mt
On special uses of this Adjective, see Jones, *Matthew 18*, 173ff, 322ff.

316 On ἔσχατος, see p.382 n.154.

317 συμφωνέω
Mt 3x: 3x No Par 18:19 Absolute Use;
20:2,13 with Preposition and Dative case.
Lk 1x: 1x Diff Mk (and Acts 2x, all with the Dative case).

318 On οὐχί, see p.274 n.332 (ii).

319 ὀφθαλμὸς πονηρός
Mt 2x: 1x No Par; 1x Diff Lk
Mk 1x: 1x >*Mt
Lk 1x: 1x Diff Mt
Mt 6:23, which corresponds grammatically to Mt 20:15, is closely paralleled by Lk 11:34. See Baumbach, *Bösen*, 79. This is a technical term of Hellenistic morality: see Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs (Walcot, *Envy*, 86- 87; Haubeck, *Weinberg*, 104 n.33).

320 On λέγοντες, see p.334 n.210 (5).

321 On λέγει, see p.334 n.210 (5).

322 A Hellenistic copy of classical syntax. The Preposition occurs at Mt 13:29. Not elsewhere in the Synoptics. On ἅμα, see p.315 n.118 (8).
πρωΐ Schenk, *Sprache*, 134.
Mt 3x: 1x No Par (20:1); 1x Diff Mk (21:18); 1x Diff Lk (16:3 Text?)
Mk 5x: 1x Diff Mt (Mk 15:1); 3x >* (Mk 11:20; 13:35; 16:2 Text?)
1x > Mt (Mk 1:35)

vocabulary,[324] ἴσος,[325] καὶ ὑμεῖς for καὶ αὐτοὶ,[326] βάρος,[327] καύσων,[328] γογγύζω,[329] and some examples of unusual word order.[330] This does not mean that redactional work is suspended here. On the contrary, the vocabulary of the parables and the parable's context are interrelated: λήμψεται (Mt 19:29; 20:10) and ἀγαθός (see Mt 19:17; 20:15). If there is no connection historically between 20:1ff and 22:1ff, ἑταῖρε must be explained as one parable influencing the vocabulary of another (see also ἆρον τὸν σόν, 20:14 and 25:25,28), or as a projection back from the Passion Narrative. The style of the narration is a style found particularly in epic parables, where the parable and redactor may shade into each other in the narrative contexts.

This is also an example of a parable which must be allowed to speak for itself. At least five possible interpretations shift to and fro across the page as the reader gives attention to it. The parable has been built into a fascinating context and the reader becomes swiftly aware of the range of reflection which the context can stimulate. First, there is reflection on the graciousness of God:[331] pictured here is the history of the whole human race vis à vis God; even those who arrive latest on the scene, the Gentiles, and who have waited on the urgency of the divine summons, will not be disappointed; those who

---

See Derrett, *Vineyard*, 51 n.10.

[323] περί + Accusative of Time; Schenk, *Sprache*, 404.

Mt 5x: 4x No Par (Mt 20:3,5,6,9); 1x Diff Mk (Mt 27:46; Mk Dative).
Mk 1x: 1x Diff Mt (Mk 6:48; Mt Dative).
Acts 3x.

Here is a further case of a link between the final parables in Matthew and the Passion Narrative. Senior, *Passion*, 294 n.5, regards the Dative in Mt 14:25 Diff Mk 6:48 as gaining precision, but treats Matthew's blurring of the Marcan indication of time in Mk 15:34 as due to Matthew's 'lack of enthusiasm for the artificial chronological structure of his account's source' (*Passion*, 294). The two explanations seem contradictory. Interchange of phrases might seem a better and more consistent hypothesis.

[324] On this, see Eichholz, *Gleichnisse*, 88, 92. On βαστάζω here, and with a different sense in Mt 3:11 and 8:17, see Rydbeck, *Fachprosa*, 154ff.

[325] ἴσος Mt 1x No Par; Mk 2x > ; Lk 1x No Par.

[326] καὶ ὑμεῖς: contrast this with Mt 19:28 Diff Lk. For the idiom, although not the word order, see Lk 6:31; 12:29,40; Mt 23:32.

[327] βάρος: see Gal 6:2. Only here in the Synoptics.

[328] καύσων: elsewhere only in Lk 12:55 (see textual issue) and Jas 1:11.

[329] γογγύζω Mt 1x No Par (Mt 20:11); Lk 1x Diff Mk or No Par (Mt 5:30).

[330] καὶ αὐτοί appears at the conclusion of v10; on the delayed Infinitive after ἔξεστι, see the Lucan parallel to Mk 12:14/Mt 22:17 Diff Lk 20:22; note the delayed Dative in v12. There are also the interesting variations of word order from verse to verse, which will be discussed later.

[331] For the range of interpretations, see Keith, *Laborers*; for an emphasis on God's goodness, see Hoppe, *Gleichnis*, 16; Derrett, *Vineyard*, 48ff; Broer, *Gleichnisexegese*.

arrived first, adherents of the Mosaic commands, have no cause to grumble at the generosity of their Lord to the Gentiles. It is a parable of divine generosity. All receive the same. Derrett argues that the subtlety of the parable lies in the particular kind of generosity shown by the owner; to those who worked only an hour he gave a wage fractionally[332] above what they had expected; they were paid just a little more than the unemployed rate; the owner was extra-generous in that sense. It is an interpretation which has its strengths, and its weaknesses too; Josephus Ant 20:219-20,[333] a key passage for this interpretation, is by no means unambiguous as supporting evidence for such a theory. It is by no means secure. Nevertheless it coheres with the overall picture that the parable is about divine generosity.

Second, there is the reverse picture: rather than offering rewards to everyone, the parable shames everyone (see 22:11-19).[334] The parable is the church's self-criticism of its own life. The church looks for security in its own activities; it seeks to be assured that there are rewards, and that work and rewards are related. Either reward has a limited role—it cannot make work more valuable, but only illustrate God's goodness—or it provokes the audience into an accusation of injustice; that sets up a contrast between what is expected in terms of reward and what the parable offers, an emphasis on invitation, on justification by grace.[335]

Third, there is the attitude of the workers (20:11). This aspect of the parable reacts strongly with the Matthean context. It speaks of the jealous annihilation of the other person, of self-justification so costly to the other and of the search for wealth at any cost.[336] The parable is an illustration of the epigram Mt 19:30/Mk 10:31, that the first are last and last first.[337] It does not illustrate a simple moral statement, as if the relation of epigram to parables were that of summary and exposition. The epigram and parables stand in the kind of relationship that often exists between fables and their summaries;[338] the one illuminates the other: the epigram the parable, the

---

[332] Derrett, *Vineyard*, 59, 75, correcting Bauer, *Gnadeslohn*, 224f. See also Blinzler, *Güte*, 12ff.

[333] Josephus Ant 20.220: εἰ μίαν τις ὥραν τῆς ἡμέρας ἐργάσαιτο τὸν μισθὸν ὑπὲρ ταύτης εὐθέως ἐλάμβανεν...where ταύτης most naturally refers to ὥραν and εὐθέως to the speed with which all payments were made, so that nothing was kept unnecessarily on deposit (20.219f).

[334] Jüngel, *Jesus*, 168; Duplacy, *Ouvriers*, 38ff; Weder, *Gleichnisse*, 229f; Hertel, *Güte*, 29.

[335] Eichholz, *Gleichnisse*, 90, 93; Scott, *Parable*, 296.

[336] Mitton, *Workers*, 308; Gryglewicz, *Workers*, 190f.

[337] Curtis, *Labourers*, 7; Biser, *Gleichnisse*, 85; Mitton, *Workers*, 309; Schottroff, *Vineyard*, 141.

[338] Flusser, *Gleichnisse*, 60: 'Bei einer guten Fabel und einem guten Gleichnis besteht eine Wechselbeziehung zwischen dem Sujet und der moralischen Lehre.'

parable the epigram. Moreover the epigram appears twice: Mt 19:30 encapsulates the material of Mt 18:1–19:29, acting as a focus for the call to recognize the place of others at whatever cost to oneself; 20:16 reflects the perils of self-seeking. Within an economy, ancient or modern, the standards of Christian life have to be worked out in specific terms and situations, and the avoidance of self-justification and self-seeking is an essential guideline.

The fourth interpretation is a sharpened form of the first, that obedience is the basis for Christian living.[339] The proximity of the parable of *The Two Sons* underlines the issue of obedience, as does the emphasis on the Father's will in 20:23 and the halakhic sections of ch. 19. It will be recalled that one interpretation of *The Two Sons* was that the last became first, in precisely this sense; it is obedience that counts.

The fifth interpretation is a sharpened form of the second: the parable is concerned with judgment, but the judgment is still in the future; it is directed at those who are confident about their reward at the Last Judgment;[340] they are sure that there is a place reserved for them. They will discover that others will come first and take the place they thought was theirs. It is the replacement theme again; it warns, as the parable of *The Tenants* did, that those who expect a reward will be replaced. The fifth interpretation is a replacement parable of a fresh kind, another possible link between the three parables *The Workers*, *The Two Sons* and *The Tenants*. Did they all originally stem from a vineyard group with a common theme, that the pious will be rejected in favour of the sinners?[341]

If there is a common factor in these five interpretations, it is that the parable carries an element of surprise. It is the unexpected in the story that by turns troubles, shocks or delights. Within the context the surprise is most clearly expressed in the reversal of expectations: it is not the rich and wise who inherit the Kingdom; it is the poor, the children, the humble and the obedient. The first will be last, and the last first.

(iii) *The Tradition*

The fifth interpretation leads directly into two areas of discussion about the tradition behind the parable. First, this is a classic epic parable with many rabbinic parallels. Its plot has many parallels. In Sifra to Lev 26:9, Midrash

---

[339] The threefold despatch of men to the vineyard (vv2,4,7) and the parallel vocabulary with Mt 21:28-29 make this interpretation particularly attractive. On the triple form, see Spies, *Arbeiter*, 279f. Schenke, *Weinberg*, 255, makes an interesting case for a double form, but the literary markers suggest that the triple solution is correct.

[340] De Ru, *Reward*, 209. The vineyard theme, the common vocabulary, the replacement theme. For the vocabulary, see van Tilborg, *Jewish Leaders*, 47 n.3.

[341] Hezser, *Weinberg*, 116f.

to Ps 4:7, Midrash to Eccles 5:11, Deut R 6:2 and other contexts, the plot concerns workers hired and paid at different rates or treated in different ways. In two of them comparisons are made by the workers themselves. In all four the parable ends with the major actor in the parable registering his own judgment. Since in every case this particular feature gives coherence to the various themes and sub-themes, particular note needs to be taken of that final statement. The plot, with its concluding statement, has also in every case a corresponding level of interpretation: the plot concerns God's relationships with his servants, with special reference to their obedience.

Mt 20:1-16 is most easily understood as another variation of that plot. But were such parallels extant at the time that Matthew was writing? Our written evidence for epic parables is mainly late. The evidence points to their use from the later part of the first century CE,[342] which was in any case the period during which Matthew's work was done.

The extended character of the parable in Mt 20:1-16 is extremely important. Because of its length it has many facets to it. Its final statement (20:13-15) also has several interesting aspects. Against the neat lucidity of many of the rabbinic parables, the conclusion has at least three elements: the due reward for labour (v13), the equal treatment of all workers (v14), and the right of the good owner to see beyond the meanness of some of his labourers (v15). As we said earlier, the Gospel parables are distinctive, as against rabbinic parables, in that their narratives retain their interest after the narrative is finished. The richness of the owner's response reveals why that should be. If 20:16 is taken into the reckoning, then the wealth of interest is still more evident. Yet another issue behind the parable is that of Christian and rabbinic understandings of reward. This affects the entire discussion of this parable.[343] A much-discussed passage in this connection is:

הוא היה אומר לא עליך המלאכה לגמור
ולא אתה בן־חורין לבטל אם למדת תורה
הרבה נותנין לך שכר הרבה ונאמן בעל
מלאכתך שישלם לך שכר פעלתך
ודע מת שכר של צדיקים לעתיד לבוא [344]

Gereboff[345] classifies this as a first-stratum saying within the Tarfon material, and notes that the fivefold outline in 2:15 is paralleled in ARN^{A} 2:[346] 1) The day is short, 2) and the work is abundant, 3) the workers are

342 Neusner, *Yohanan.*
343 Derrett, *Vineyard*, 72ff; Preisker, *TDNT*, 4.695f; De Ru, *Reward*, 202f.
344 Text as in *Die Mischna Aboth* (K. Marti and G. Beer), 2:16.
345 Gereboff, *Tarfon*, 240f.
346 Goldin, p.115.

lazy, 4) and the reward is great, 5) and the owner is (demanding). He takes the saying to refer to the need for continual persistence in Torah study and argues that it has no thematic coherence with other homiletic material of the same stratum.[347] He finds no way of identifying the principles on which the Mishnah–Tosefta material was selected, and defines the earliest stratum of the Tarfon traditions as referring to a Yavnean Pharisee and priest, interested in whether objective facts or subjective presumptions are the determinative factors in evaluating action, i.e. is the deed or the intention determinative?[348] The saying above, on 'reward', can be seen within the context of human responsibility for thoughts and action, within the policy of maintaining the priesthood as the centre of Israelite religious life, and within the given situation in which responsibility is exercised:[349] the work of Torah study cannot be completed; it must simply be continued; but persistence in the work has a value which is guaranteed, by the one who defines its necessity, for the one who persists in it.

It is clear from this discussion that a simple comparison of Christian and rabbinic ideas of reward is not possible. A summary which grounds 'reward', for both groups, in the grace and mercy of God, is a secure finding. But from that point onward the meaning of reward moves out into the area of how human responsibility is to be understood. It is precisely this issue which, from the Christian point of view, is unclear as far as the first century CE is concerned. The parable of *The Workers* grounds all discussion of reward in the generosity of God. From there onward the narrative opens up for discussion areas of mutual responsibility.

If the 'vineyard parables' were associated as a triplet, with a common centre in the rejection of those who expected a place in the Kingdom and the reception of those who did not, then for that stage in the parable's history the gracious activity of God was understood to be at work, opening up in a sequence of messengers, with Jesus as their climax, possibilities of response, and doing so particularly for those economically or socially deprived.[350]

(iv) *The History of the Parables*

The parable has been described as an extended epic. An extended epic appears in some ways to be a contradiction in terms. As Funk has indicated,[351] Mt 20:1-16 represents a kind of Greek that has been 'vacuumed for the

[347] Gereboff, *Tarfon*, 414.
[348] Gereboff, *Tarfon*, 435f.
[349] Gereboff, *Tarfon*, 441ff.
[350] See p.162.
[351] Funk, *Parables*, 43ff; on the parable's structure, see Scott, *Parable*, 288, and Schnider, *Weinberg*, 90f.

occasion'. Its unadorned simplicity of style has its own solemnity. It relies on organization, repetition with variation, assonance and phrased sentences, presented in such a way that each rhythmic grouping constitutes a further idea to add to the total structure. Each one of these can be illustrated from this parable:

1) Organization. vv1,2,3 all end with εἰς τὸν ἀμπελῶνα [αὐτοῦ], with the variation that v3 lacks αὐτοῦ. Act I is organized by means of three uses of ἐξελθὼν in vv3,5,6, accompanied by two uses of ἄλλους ἑστῶτας. A further use of εἰς τὸν ἀμπελῶνα in v7 ends the first Act, accompanied, as in v4, by ὑπάγετε καὶ ὑμεῖς. Act II is heralded by a Genitive Absolute and divided by two uses of ἐλθόντες. Act III is structured for the first time in the parable as a conversation.

2) Repetition and Variation. In addition to the structural repetitions, other repetitions give the narrative a simple clarity: e.g. ἐργάτας/ἐργατῶν vv1,2; or give subtle nuances, as συμφωνήσας δὲ v2, quoted argumentatively as συμφώνησάς μοι in v13. Variations include grammatical variations: v5 ἐνάτην ὥραν; v9 τὴν ἑνδεκάτην ὥραν; there are variations to compress the narration: e.g. v5 gives two visits of the owner to the marketplace, whereas vv3 and 6 deal only with one; the variations produce a sense of drama: e.g. the owner οἰκοδεσπότης in v1 and ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος in v8, with a reversion to the original title in v11. Variations of order are found: v2ab and v4 have reversed subjects. Repetition can also bridge over from one Act to another: λαμβάνω 2x in v10 and at the beginning of v11.

3) Assonance. This includes homoeoteleuton: e.g. καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰς vv4 and 7. There are -ων endings in v 8, -αν endings in v12, the -οι endings in v16; there are onomatopoeic words: e g. ἐγγόγυζον (for another example, see σβέννυνται in 25:1-13), alliteration: e.g. τοῖς βαστάσασι τὸ βάρος, and anagrams: ἀργοὶ/ἀγορὰ/ἐργάτας.

4) Phrased Sentences. The verses divide up into phrases: e.g. counting syllables, v8 runs 8/11/7: 7/7: 10/5—each of the syllable groups adds a new factor: e.g. 7/7 κάλεσον τοὺς ἐργάτας / καὶ ἀπόδος τὸν μισθόν (Text?)
10/5 ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῶν ἐσχάτων / ἕως τῶν πρώτων.
To the stylistic description must be added the evaluation of the parable's acts in terms of plot and outline. Characteristic of the epic parable is the theme and sub-motif, involving two or three characters (or character groups),[352] the conversation technique, which paradoxically both slows up the narration and moves the drama to its conclusion, and the final statement of the subject of the parable.

The epic parable uses variation as a principle of construction. In several of Matthew's epic parables these variants are numerous and significant.

352 Flusser, *Gleichnisse*, 303.

Sometimes they are identifiably part of the redaction; sometimes it is hard to say whether they are tradition or redaction. The richness of the conclusion to the parable of *The Workers* illustrates the way in which the Matthean epic is extended. The extension increases the parable's potential and its range of reference.

(v) *The Parable and its Place in Matthean Redaction*

It is significant that this fine narrative has been allowed to stand, with the main editorial contributions consisting only perhaps in the overlap of 20:16a and Mk 10:31, and in the integration of the parable into the surrounding context, particularly by means of vocabulary. The quality of the narration has been identified as one which offers room for reflection. It is in this respect that Via's observations on the autonomous character of the story can be sustained.[353] The acts and the plot are centripetal in their effect, involving the hearer in one operation of understanding, but setting the hearer free to reflect at a number of different levels. At the conclusion of the parable such a profusion of possibilities is offered that the economy of the narrative is for the moment lost.

But within its Matthean context *The Workers* contributes to the reshaping of that context. It is, like the other parables in chs. 21–22, a disturbing influence, echoing questions and uncertainties, raising profound issues which cannot be given a simple answer, suggesting that little is certain or reliable apart from the nature of God's grace and justice.[354] As a replacement parable, *The Workers* underlines the sense of uncertainty which pervades those chapters. The usual foundations of confidence are being undermined; contributors to the challenge of the new order are the parables, not least the extended epic parables such as 20:1ff.

---

[353] Via, *Parables*, 24f.

[354] See pp.138-139.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE ESCHATOLOGICAL PARABLES

A. *The Fig Tree* Mt 24:32-33/ Mk 13:28-29/ Lk 21:29-31

(i) *The Context*

The Matthean version of the instruction in 24:32 closely resembles the Marcan.[1] In the Marcan context it presents a sign, possibly the sign, that the destruction of the Temple will happen soon; the imminent catastrophes are the eschatological events which intimate that the Final Judgment is near and that the new beginning is about the break.[2] As such, it is a parallel to the fig-tree narratives in Mk 11:12-14, 20-25. In the Matthean context, as also in the parallel fig-tree narrative (Mt 21:18-22), instead of the major interest being the fall of Jerusalem, attention is concentrated on how much must happen before the end, how far the Gospel must be proclaimed, on the dangers of listening to false prophets and on the self-evident character of the end when it finally comes.[3] The 'sign' (24:3) which is asked for could be

---

[1] Klauck, *Allegorie*, 316ff.

[2] Telford, *Barren Temple*, 217f; Hooker, *Mark*, 267, 320.

[3] On the structure of Mt 24-25, see Agbanou, *Discours*, 38-44. The Particles, as in the case of Mt 13, suggest an outline which has some subsections, but, as modern translations betray by omissions and additions, no simple and uniform direction (see, for example, οὖν Diff Mk at v15).

v1 The disciples show Jesus the Temple.
v2 δὲ But Jesus responds 'Its destruction will be complete'.
v3 δὲ Now as he sat they enquired in private:
(i) When will these things be?
(ii) What is the sign of your Parousia...
(iii) ...and of the End of the Ages?
v4 καὶ And(?) Jesus answered: 'Beware of mis-leaders!'
v5 γάρ Why? Because there will be many pretenders.
v6 Rumours of war should not lead to panic.
γάρ For (Diff Mk; Par Lk) this must happen before the end
v7 γάρ For (Par Mk; DiffLk) kingdoms will go to war with each other.
v8 δὲ But (Diff Mk) these are only the pains of childbirth.
v9 τότε Then (Diff Mk) you will be arrested, killed and hated by all.
v10 καὶ τότε And then apostasy, mutual betrayal and hatred follow.
v11 καὶ And a host of false prophets will mislead many.
v12 καὶ And lawlessness will increase and so love grow cold.
v13 δὲ But (Par Mk; Diff Lk) anyone who endures will be saved.

either the σημεῖον in 24:30,[4] or the self-evident indications of the end 24:27,28, or the reference to these in 24:33.[5] Whatever the precise answer may be, the two Matthean additions to the Marcan outline, Mt 24:26-28/Lk 17:23f,37 and Mt 24:30,31a, provide the parable in Matthew with a redactional context which alters its function.

(ii) *The Redaction*

The language of the instruction given in 24:32-33 is puzzling, if a fraction clearer than in Mark.[6] παραβολή appears to mean 'teaching content', 'message' or, best of all, 'profound meaning'.[7] θέρος must have eschatological overtones; i.e. it means the 'harvest-judgement'.[8] οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς is probably emphatic in Matthew; i.e. when you, as distinct from those who would mislead you or are misled, see these things.[9] The subject

---

v14 καὶ And universal proclamation will precede the end.
v15 οὖν Therefore (Diff Mk; Diff Lk) when you see the Dreadful Sacrilege
v16 τότε then let those in Judaea flee,
v17 without returning home
v18 καὶ and without going back for clothing.
v19 Woe to mothers with children!
v20 δὲ But (Par Mk) pray it is not in the winter nor on the sabbath!
v21 γάρ (τότε) For (Par Mk) then will be the great tribulation.
v22 καὶ And had the days not been shortened, all would perish.
v23 τότε Then (> καί as in Mk) beware of messianic prophets!
v24 γάρ For (Diff Mk) false christs and prophets will mislead.
v25 ἰδού See (Diff Mk), I have forewarned you.
v26 ἐὰν οὖν If therefore (Diff Lk) they say 'He's there!' do not believe them.
v27 γάρ For (Par Lk) the Son of Man's Coming will be like lightning.
v28 The logion of the corpse and the birds of prey.
v29 εὐθέως δὲ And? (Diff Mk) immediately after, there will be cosmic signs.
v30 καὶ τότε And then (Par Mk) will appear the Son of Man's sign.
v31 καὶ And (> τότε as in Mk) the Son of Man will gather the elect.
v32 δὲ And? (Par Mk) take the fig tree as a parable: 'Summer is near!'
v33 οὕτως In the same way recognize the time is near.
v34 This generation will experience it all.
v35 My words are reliable.
v36 δὲ But (ParMk) no one, not even the Son, knows when it will be.

[4] See Higgins, *The Sign*.

[5] Brown, *Apocalypse*, 7, takes the Genitive as epexegetic. But the movement of the chapter sets σημεῖον alongside the many false indications of the coming of the Messiah. The phrase may therefore refer to true indications of the coming of the Messiah, i.e. the Genitive is objective.

[6] Telford, *Barren Temple*, 213.

[7] Telford, *Barren Temple*, 242 n.32.

[8] Telford, *Barren Temple*, 242 n.33.

[9] Telford, *Barren Temple*, 213, and also see Mt 24:24. Either use of γινώσκετε in vv32-33 could be Indicative or Imperative. It is most likely that the first is Indicative and the second Imperative (see 16:4 and 24:26).

of ἐγγύς...ἐστιν in v33 is the Son of Man, as the parallel in 24:26 ἰδοὺ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ...ἰδοὺ ἐν τοῖς ταμιείοις confirms.[10] πάντα ταῦτα is repeated in Mt 24:34 and almost certainly refers to the End events as a whole. In 24:34ff Matthew again is fractionally clearer than Mark's Gospel, which has both chiasmus and assonance.[11] So, because of the micro- and macro-contexts, the fig-tree imagery operates differently in Matthew. It symbolizes the blessings of the end-time, the fearfulness of the end-time, and probably the separation of the good from among the bad.[12]

(iii) *The Tradition*

Telford traces the fig-tree material in the Gospels to Old Testament passages, and particularly to a Judaeo-Christian haggadic tale in which Jesus was said to have been refused fruit from an Israel which was blind to the dawning of the New Age.[13] The tale was brought into relation to the tradition of Jesus' visit to Jerusalem, eventually prefiguring the destruction of the Temple. Matthew revised the story in a didactic direction. Luke rejected it, preferring a parable concerning the time given by God's grace for repentance (Lk 13:6-9). The Marcan parable may go back to a level of tradition which compared natural signs with the 'signs of the time'. These were overlooked by those who seek a sign (Mt 12:28/Lk 11:20; Mt 11:5/Lk 7:22; Lk 12:54-56).[14]

The synoptic fig-tree imagery belongs to a body of material used by the Early Church in which the fig tree was an emblem of prosperity, past, present or especially future. The future included blessing as well as judgment.[15] The fig tree also served as an image of humanity's religious life and of Israel's privilege and faithlessness. In rabbinic use the symbolism of the fig was explored with reference to the wicked and the righteous, as individuals and as part of the community, and in haggadic contexts the references to the new heaven and earth or the new Jerusalem gave it additional eschatological resonance.[16] In the New Testament the association of tree imagery is with judgment (see Mt 3:10/Lk 3:9; Mt 15:3; Lk 23:32),

---

[10] Telford, *Barren Temple*, 213f, who considers 'harvest judgment' (Schwartz, Bacon), Son of Man or Messiah (Wendling, Jeremias), the Messianic Age (Derrett), or the Kingdom (Luke). See Derrett, *Figtrees*, 249ff.

[11] τὰ φύλλα, ἐκφύῃ, γινώσκετε, ἐγγύς, θέρος, ἐπὶ θύραις, ἤδη ὁ κλάδος appear in both Matthew and Mark. In Mark γένηται and ἐκφύῃ are arranged chiastically. This chiasm is lost in Matthew 24:32.

[12] Telford, *Barren Temple*, 176-196, 215.

[13] Telford, *Barren Temple*, 238.

[14] Dupont, *Figuier*, 541f.

[15] Telford, *Barren Temple*, 162.

[16] Feldmann, *Parable*, 154f; Derrett, *Figtrees*, 251f; Löw, *Feigengleichnis*, 167f.

or fruitfulness and harvest (the Vineyard parables) or character (Mt 7:16/Lk 6:44), or end-time (see Jn 1:48-50).[17]

(iv) *The History of the Parables*

The history of the Lucan parable of the *Fig Tree* in Lk 13:6-9 is described in various ways. In source-critical terms it could be regarded as a secondary creation or as an item taken from the Special Lucan Source;[18] in form-critical terms it appears to be a similitude, with two exempla within an argumentatio.[19] It could be a historical allegory used by Jesus concerning the fate of Jerusalem; but more likely, in view of its form-critical role, it illustrates the development of figurative into parabolic material during the early history of the Jesus tradition. The Marcan and Matthean instruction in Mt 24:32f and Mark 13:28f resembles both Lk 12:54-56 and Mt 24:27/Lk 17:24, differing from the first in having an Imperative[20] and from the latter in lacking an initial comparative Particle. Matthew treats the figurative material as a mystery to be explained, in the manner of the Vision Interpretation, or as a similitude moving in its second half toward metaphor (Mt 24:32bc), and followed by a comparison which modifies and clarifies the metaphor (Mt 24:33).[21] In either case the rhetorical form has been adapted to an apocalyptic context. So the history of the parables points to various developments from a basic figurative use.

(v) *The History of Redaction*

The rhetorical figure of the fig tree is redactionally adapted in Matthew. By means of contextual touches there are hints of moral distinctions authorized by the teaching of Jesus (Mt 24:35). These will characterize the way in which the Son of Man (Mt 24:31) will judge how everyone lives in the interim (Mt 24:36). As in the case of ch. 15, Matthew's editing includes a subtle exploitation of the figurative material in his source. The adaptability of the figurative material allows the editor freedom to remain close to his source but to develop its range of reference. Having passed through stages of historical and eschatological reference, the figurative material is adapted to a new role: through it a characteristic Matthean morality is unfolded.

---

[17] Telford, *Barren Temple*, 218f; von Gemünden, *Vegetationsmetaphorik*, 415ff.

[18] See Telford, *Barren Temple*, 224-233. The parable is not a Lucan composition; see Heininger, *Metaphorik*, 124.

[19] Heininger, *Metaphorik*, 121 n.1.

[20] See n.9 above.

[21] See Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, 5.11.23; also McCall, *Simile*, 98f.

B. *The Thief* Mt 24:42-4/Lk 12:39-40

(i) *The Context*

The eschatological discourse has reached the last of the Q material shared with Lk 17 (Mt 24:37-40/Lk 17:26-27,34-35): the contrast between Noah in his ark and his unheeding contemporaries[22] warns that the Parousia will bring about an unexpected division within humankind. The material shared with Luke 12 follows immediately: *The Thief*, *The Two Servants* and *The Ten Young Women* (24:42-44/Lk 12:39-40; 24:45-51/Lk 12:42-46; 25:8ff/ Lk 12:35-36). This group of eschatological parables is introduced by Mt 24:42, which has parallels in Mk 13:33,35, Lk 24:44/Lk 12:40 and Lk 12:37-38.[23] An almost identical logion appears in Mt 25:13. A derivation of this logion from the Marcan outline would be certain, were it not for the possibility of Q influence here.[24] Did Matthew 24:42 stand in Q? If γρηγορέω (24:42f) and φυλακή (24:43) were found by Matthew in a Q tradition which included Lk 12:37-38, then 24:42 could be a relic of an earlier collection of parables: *The Thief*, *The Two Servants*, *The Serving Lord* and *The Watching Servants*.[25] That theory however has its difficulties. It leaves unexplained why Matthew, alongside an unusually close agreement with Luke in the section in Mt 24:43-51, omitted Lk 12:37 yet retained ὥρᾳ in Mt 24:44=Lk 12:40.[26] The solution adopted here will be that 24:43 was part of the Q tradition known to Matthew but its form belonged to a trilogy of parables, *The Thief*, *The Two Servants* and *The Young Women*, in which the extension of the latter parable to include the 'sleeping' motif drew the associated parables into the same complex of ideas found in 1 Thess 4:13–5:11,[27] where 'thief', 'night', 'watching', 'sleeping', εἰς ἀπάντησιν, 'drunkenness', coexist in uncomfortable proximity with 'sons of the day' as against 'those who belong to the night'. The Q trilogy may have been concerned primarily with ignorance of the time of the Son of Man's coming; it need only have become associated with watchfulness when 24:42

---

[22] See Schulz, *Q*, 277f; Gollinger, *Auslegung*, 238ff; Catchpole, *Q*, 247-255, suggests a parallelism between the Noah and the Lot tradition and argues for the position of Mt 24:28 as an earlier tradition than its position in Lk 17:37b; see Agbanou, *Discours*, 123f.

[23] Schürmann, *Untersuchungen*, 124; Marshall, *Luke*, 536.

[24] Bauckham, *Parousia*, 166; why Matthew should have made so small an alteration to the source material is not considered by Bauckham.

[25] Bauckham, *Parousia*, 166.

[26] This is damaging to Bauckham's case, since Mt 13:37 is his solitary synoptic example of deparabolizing. On this section, see Weiser, *Knechtgleichnisse*, 131ff.

[27] Lövestam, *Wakefulness*, 104.

was added.[28] The association of the three parables with 'watchfulness' in both Matthew and Luke (Mt 24:42; Lk 12:37) could however mean that Matthew and Luke shared a developed form of the trilogy, that by the time they came to use the trilogy, watchfulness had already been added to the theme of ignorance. The addition of 24:42 in that case would have confirmed rather than introduced the theme. The hypothesis of the trilogy seems to work best; Mt 24:42, along with Mt 25:13, linked the trilogy with the Marcan framework through the common theme of 'watch'. Because the time of the Parousia cannot be known in advance, it is essential to 'watch', and the parables indicate the kind of watching which is required.

(ii) *The Redaction*

The interpretation of γρηγορέω[29] is of great importance for the Matthean redaction. It includes the following factors:

1) It is essential to avoid the all-too-ordinary carelessness and unthinking security exemplified by Noah's contemporaries in Mt 24:37-41/Lk 17:26ff;[30] by refusing God's wisdom, they themselves were rejected (Wis 10:4; Philo, Vit Mos II:57-59; 3 Macc 2:4; Gen R 27:1-4[31]); by contrast, Noah showed obedience at the time when salvation was offered (1 Pet 3:20; 2 Pet 2:5).[32]

2) 'Watching' is contrasted with 'sleep'.[33] On the one hand Matthew shares with Mark in the Gethsemane pericope (Mt 26:40,43,45/Mk 14:37,40,41)[34] the concern with πειρασμός (Mt 26:41/Mk 14:38) which threatens our weakness[35] with weariness, laziness and self-indulgence; on

---

[28] Catchpole, *Q*, 57.

[29] γρηγορέω Schenk, *Sprache*, 152f.
Mt 6x: 4x Par Mk; 1x No Par; 1x Diff Lk(?)
Mk 6x: 4x Par Mt; 1x >*; 1x >
Lk 2x: 1x No Par; 1x Text?

[30] Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 75-83.

[31] The absence of the Lot tradition is particularly noteworthy in view of its presence in Luke, and perhaps in parts of the Q tradition; see n.23 above.

[32] On the days of Lot and Noah as days of opportunity for repentance, see Catchpole, *Q*, 251.

[33] καθεύδω Schenk, *Sprache*, 153.
Mt 7x: 5x Par Mk; 2x No Par
Mk 8x: 5x Par Mt; 1x > Mt; 2x >
Lk 2x: 2x Par Mk
The Verb covers four main areas of reference: 1) Physical sleep: Mt 8:24/Mk 4:38/Lk > ; 2) Related to death: Mt 9:24/Mk 5:39/Lk 8:52 (see Rochais, *Résurrection*, 197ff); 3) Danger and vulnerability: Mt 13:25; 4) Weakness of moral character: see n.34 below.

[34] Senior, *Passion*, 108ff.

[35] Kuhn, *Gethsemane*, 260ff; Hagner, *Matthew*, I 151.

the other hand they share the concern with prayer and faith (Mt 21:20-22;[36] Mt 9:24).[37]

3) The avoidance of 'being caught unready' marks the contrast between those who 'watch' into the early hours (24:43) and those who are ready (ἕτοιμοι 24:44).[38] This includes a time factor, a period of 'watching', with the inference that such an intervening period must be characterized by the right kind of behaviour (24:49). Lövestam assembles some valuable rabbinic and Pharisaic evidence on 'sleep' as symbolic of sin, and on 'wakefulness' as acceptance of the warnings, discipline and instruction of God.[39] The relevance of this finding will appear in the studies on 25:1-13 and 25:14-30. In the context of *The Thief*, whose clandestine activities are his chief characteristic,[40] 'watching' means using the interim period well and not hoarding wealth (Mt 6:19f). It is one of the purposes of the eschatological discourse in Matthew to indicate that the interim could last a long time.

4) The warning to 'watchfulness' is for those who acknowledge the Son of Man. In contrast to Mk 13:35 πότε ὁ κύριος τῆς οἰκίας ἔρχεται, Matthew has ποίᾳ ἡμέρᾳ ὁ κύριος ὑμῶν ἔρχεται.[41] This is a result of the association of the two parables, *The Thief* and *The Two Servants*.[42]

Of these four factors, 2) and 4) are common to Matthew and Paul, and factor 2) was expanded by them both in similar terms. One of the tests is that the false prophets who may lure the faithful into a false sense of security (1 Thess 5:3; Mt 24:23ff). In the case of 3) and 4), the longer time available in Matthew and the different expositions of κύριος[43] render Matthew and Paul distinct.

---

[36] See Telford, *Barren Temple*, 69f, for this section as a paradigm of prayer and faith. It provides the catechetical counterpart to the Matthean concern with the powers of the Kingdom.

[37] On prayer in relation to the healing miracles, see Heil, *Healing*, 286.

[38] Schulz, *Q*, 269 n.14.

[39] Lövestam, *Wakefulness*, Section I.

[40] Lövestam, *Wakefulness*, 97.

[41] ποῖος Schenk, *Sprache*, 415.
Mt 7x: 4x Par Mk; 1x Diff Mk; 1x Par Lk; 1x Diff Mk or Diff Lk
Mk 4x: 4x Par Mt
Lk 9x: 2x Par Mk; 1x Par Mt; 2x No Par; 1x Diff Mk; 2x Diff Mt; 1xText?
πότε Schenk, *Sprache*, 417.
Mt 7x: 3x Par Mk; 4x No Par
Mk 5x: 3x Par Mt; 2x Diff Mt
Lk 4x: 2x No Par; 2x Par Mk

[42] Lövestam, *Wakefulness*, 103.

[43] Betz, *Sermon*, 128 n.13.

(iii) *The Tradition*

The imagery of the thief is unusual in Judaism, but by no means unknown.[44] It was certainly known in the Christian tradition prior to 1 Thess 5:2; that is evident from the incongruity of the 'thief in the night' and the 'children of the light' themes (see 1 Thess 5:4f.), and it was probably, for the same reason, used prior to 1 Thessalonians of the 'Day of the Lord',[45] the day which will come with shattering suddenness (1 Thess 5:3).[46] In 1 Thessalonians the imagery is at home in an apocalyptic setting. There the chosen are engaged in a struggle for light against darkness in which their fate but not their reward is secure.[47]

The Q logion takes us no nearer to an earlier form for several reasons: it assumes, pessimistically, that the thief must come and the only question is when; it is associated with a probably secondary Son of Man logion;[48] and it is linked with a parable, *The Two Servants*, which suggests its proximity to 1 Thess 5:2ff, distinguishing faithful from unfaithful. There is in fact no form of the parable which lacks that distinction, except GThom 85 lines 7-10 (Logion 21b),[49] and then only when lines 7-10 are isolated from their context, and ⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲣⲟ is disregarded.[50] The 'thief' metaphor in Rev 3:3[51] and 16:15[52] became a warning of judgment to the faithful, and 2 Pet 3:10[53] uses the imagery of the cosmic Day of the Lord, in which the faithful must be sure to find security in the Saviour Christ. Did 16:1f [54] have the same warning to the faithful not to fall away, in a strongly apocalyptic scheme of end-events? There will be corrupters and false prophets to test them. They must watch over their Christian lives. In Gnostic writings the 'thief' is 'the world',[55] and in patristic writings the associated themes vary from Christian existence[56] to pedagogical instruction.[57] None of these can be used as evidence for a pre-Q form of the parable.

---

[44] Num R 9:9; Lev R 23:12; Ex R 20:1. Grässer, *Problem*, 93 n.5.

[45] Jeremias, *Parables*, 49f; Schulz, *Q*, 270.

[46] On the textual problem here, see Preisker, *TDNT*, 3.756 n.5.

[47] Sanders, *Palestinian Judaism*, 448 n.8; Collins, *Tradition*, 325ff.

[48] Casey, *Son of Man*, 216.

[49] Schrage, *Thomas-Evangeliums*, 67.

[50] Schrage, *Thomas-Evangeliums*, 67-68; for the role of the thief motif in Thomas, see Fieger, *Thomas*, 98.

[51] Sweet, *Revelation*, 100; however, the parallelism between Revelation and Matthew 24-25 is not as close as *Revelation*, 52-54, envisages.

[52] Smitmans, *Dieb*, 43.

[53] Smitmans, *Dieb*, 45, 62.

[54] Smitmans, *Dieb*, 64.

[55] Fieger, *Thomas*, 98.

[56] Smitmans, *Dieb*, 65.

[57] Smitmans, *Dieb*, 66.

(iv–v) *The History of the Parables and the History of Redaction*
Bauckham refers to these uses as illustrative of a process of 'deparabolisation'.[58] As we have seen, the process is not particularly well attested[59] and it is questionable whether, in a case where the original form of the parable cannot be reconstructed, the original form should be assumed to be a simile rather than a metaphor or picture saying.[60] The metaphor here is of course a violent one; it may not have lent itself easily to personal associations, except in Rev 3:3 and 16:15, where it appears in the form of similes, or in GThom, where it is allegorical; however, it would seem unwise to make what appears to be a unique and hypothetical usage into a specially designated paradigm. The relation between parables and paraenetic material must be discussed later, but it could well be significant that the connections between the synoptic parables and epistolary paraenesis are few.[61] The parables serve instead of paraenesis; they supplement paraenesis, but they do not themselves become paraenesis.

C. *The Two Servants* Mt 24:45-51/Lk 12:42-46

(i) *The Context*
This is the second of the parables from the sequence of three available to Matthew in a version of Q.[62] Like the first, it is found in almost word-for-word agreement with Luke. Lk 12:42-26 appears as the parable of *The Servant* in the Lucan context, along with two Beatitudes (vv37 and 38) and three other parables: *The Watching Servants* (Lk 12:35f), *The Serving Lord* (Lk 12:37) and *The Thief*.[63] Although this collection may represent an earlier grouping of parables, the claim that such a collection has similarities with Mk 13:33-37, and therefore has a history going back to Jesus, is unjustified. It is true that the different traditions share common themes and share those themes with early material: the 'coming', 'finding', 'sleeping' sequence is found in all the Synoptics in the Gethsemane pericope (Mt 26:40; Mk 14:37; Lk 22:45); there is the association of γρηγορέω with eschatological parables, for which there is early independent evidence in 1 Thess 5:1ff, and there is the theme of servants waiting for their Lord's return, a return which could be at any watch of the night. But although the themes are shared with early material, they are found in Mark and Luke in

58 Bauckham, *Parousia*, 175ff.
59 See n.27 above.
60 Bauckham, *Parousia*, 170.
61 Moule, *Use of Parables*, 76-78.
62 Schulz, *Q*, 271ff.
63 Weiser, *Knechtsgleichnisse*, 161-177.

different orders and with variant groupings. In the case of *The Watching Servants* (Lk 12:35-38) and *The Door-keeper* (Mk 13:34c) there is a similarity noted by Dodd and Jeremias,[64] but the dissimilarities are too great for a common original parable to be identified. Only the reference to the night-return, as Lövestam notes, provides a distinctive common denominator, and this could point to a common level of tradition with the 'thief in the night'. But a route back from that level to the Jesus of history is hard to find.

In addition to the early collection of eschatological parables in the trio common to Matthew and Luke, other groupings of the eschatological parables occurred subsequently in the period before Matthew and Luke were written. A clue to this development is to be found in a Question–Beatitude–Promise form. It is a form of some antiquity and carries some Semitic features within it. It is found particularly within the Lucan tradition, but is present also in part in the Matthean. There is a sequence of Lucan Beatitudes in Luke 12: Lk 12:37 and 38 provide a sequence leading naturally into the third Beatitude within the parable of *The Two Servants* itself (Lk 12:43):

1) v37 μακάριοι οἱ δοῦλοι ἐκεῖνοι οὓς ἐλθὼν ὁ κύριος εὑρήσει γρηγοροῦντας.

2) v38 κἂν...ἔλθῃ καὶ εὕρῃ οὕτως, μακάριοί εἰσιν ἐκεῖνοι.

3) v43 μακάριος ὁ δοῦλος ἐκεῖνος ὃν ἐλθὼν ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ εὑρήσει ποιοῦντα οὕτως.

The third Beatitude appears in Matthew, in a wording identical with Luke in Mt 24:46, but the first and second Beatitudes do not appear. In Beatitude 2), Lk 12:38, οὕτως refers to 'staying awake'; in Beatitude 3), Mt 24:46/Lk 12:43, οὕτως refers to 'making provision for those in his care'. If, as seems likely, the parable of *The Two Servants* with its Beatitude in Mt 24:46/Lk 12:43 is part of a longer form, then the position of the two previous Beatitudes in the Lucan tradition deserves fresh attention. In Beatitudes 1) and 3), the Lucan form includes a further element: in Lk 12:37b there is a Promise introduced by ἀμην λέγω ὑμῖν, and in Lk 12:44 there is a Promise similarly introduced by ἀληθῶς λέγω ὑμῖν (Diff Mt ἀμην λέγω ὑμῖν: Mt 24:47). As far as the opening of the Question–Beatitude–Promise pattern is concerned, some examples of the pattern have Interrogative openings. This is of course characteristic of a similitude such as *The Two Servants* and Lk 12:25-27/Mt 6:27-29. Characteristic of the pattern is also the use of οὕτως, as in Lk 15:7-10 (differing in detail from Mt 18:12-14), Lk 17:7-10 (No Par), 14:28-33 (No Par).[65] The Lucan tradition suggests that the parable in Mt 24:45-51/Lk 12:42-46 belonged to a sequence. The expression ἀμην

[64] See Lövestam, *Wakefulness*, 79f.

[65] Lk 11:5-8 lacks οὕτως.

λέγω ὑμῖν in Mt 24:47 points to a link between the Lucan sequence and the Matthean trio of parables. In view of Matthew's close agreement with Luke in two parts of the trio, and especially in *The Two Servants*, and in view of the variations within the synoptic parallels in relation to the third, there is some likelihood that these two synoptic traditions sprang from a similar source, and that, before the editors began their work, already different groupings of parables had been established, perhaps the Lucan retaining *The Watching Servants*, *The Serving Lord*, *The Thief* and *The Servants*, and the Matthean preserving the wording and form of the first two parables, with an example of the Beatitude sequence in Mt 24:45-46 (and its obverse in vv47-51), followed by an extended form of the third parable, the parable of *The Young Women.*

(ii) *The Redaction*

There are three major areas of redactional interest here:

1) The 'Wisdom' additions.

Although the inner construction of the two sections of this parable does not exhibit as exact a balance as in 7:24-27, *The Two Servants* resembles *The Two Houses* in outline, and by its use of Wisdom terms it underlines the contrast between the sections.[66] The first section of *The Two Servants* expresses the 'Question–Beatitude–Promise' form in Wisdom terminology.[67] The second half of the parable, although it does not repeat the structure of the first, provides a 'Wisdom' contrast, highlighted in Matthew by the Matthean addition κακός (Mt 24:48). This second half has balancing sections within it: Mt 24:29a and b, 50b and c, 51a and b. There are different stylistic features in Luke and these make the balance less obvious (especially in Lk 12:45). Mt 24:51c falls outside this balancing structure, although as a balance to the Promise section in 24:47 it provides a corresponding Threat; v51c is a logion found only in Matthew here, but elsewhere it is retained both by Matthew and by Luke in Mt 8:12/Lk 13:27, where it describes the distress endured by those displaced from the Kingdom. Elements of assonance, alliteration, rhythmic balance and chiasmus are found in both halves and in both Gospels. The repetition of ἐκεῖνος in Mt 24:48 and 50 is destructive of the pithy brevity found in similar parables (e.g. Mt 18:23-29). The level of interpretation too can be paralleled with what we found in 7:24-27; the level of the narration and the level of interpretation are distinguishable. But, unlike the fable-type parable, *The Two Servants* deals with activities which could be as relevant at the level of interpretation as they are at the level of narration. It is possible to discount

[66] See pp.179-180.

[67] Weiser, *Knechtsgleichnisse*, 180ff; Burnett, *Sophia*, and *Prolegomenon.*

the relevance of that level of interpretation, but that may not be appropriate, either at the Q or at the redactional stage. The main Wisdom addition in Matthew provides a contrast. It offers a contrast within an eschatological context. Matthew's version (Mt 24:48) introduces κακός,[68] as against μωρός, the opposite to φρόνιμος in *The Ten Young Women* (25:2) and *The Two Houses* (7:26) (or as against the other possible alternative, πονηρός as in Mt 15:19 Diff Mk 7:21 κακός). This contrast of characterization, φρόνιμος/κακός, in advance of the action, suggests that the division between the two halves of the parable is one concerning moral quality. It separates the Lord's servants from each other at the Last Judgment.[69] So each of the openings of the two halves of the parable refers to a different individual, and the title *The Two Servants* becomes necessary and appropriate, suiting the Matthean context exactly.

2) The phrase: χρονίζει ὁ κύριος (μου) Mt 24:48/Lk 12:45.

The translation of this phrase is disputed. Does it mean 'My lord delays'? Or does it mean 'My lord is away a long time'?[70] Taken alone, in isolation from its context, the narrative seems to require the second. The Lord returns unexpectedly early. It is not that the servant reckons with an extended period, but rather that he does not expect the master's return so soon. His evil practices are a risk he is prepared to take. But, unfortunately for him, detection comes before he expects. The Verb also appears in 25:5 with the 'bridegroom' as subject. There the sense required is that the bridegroom was away longer than the young women expected, so much longer indeed that they dozed off. They had gone out to meet him (25:1), expecting him, and he was late. So the same Verb, χρονίζει, appears in the two successive parables, and their narratives, isolated from their contexts, suggest two different translations. 25:5 appears to suit the Matthean context of the eschatological discourse particularly well. The discourse has warned against those who encourage their hearers to go out to meet him (Mt 24:26). When he comes it will be a cosmic event for all to see (Mt 24:27). It will be preceded by a list of events which are still awaiting fulfilment, including the proclamation of the Kingdom across the world (Mt 24:14). So the coming of the bridegroom is not yet, and what matters is how we live in the interim, whether we live in unheeding ignorance (24:39), or as those who are morally prepared. In its context, followed immediately by 25:1-13, Mt 24:48/Lk 12:45 takes on a different nuance. Although 24:48, taken in isolation, could imply an earlier than expected return, in its present context 24:48 could mean 'The servant who courts disaster by foolishly reckoning on the Lord's delay, and behaves wickedly, will receive a just recompense'.

---

[68] Weiser, *Knechtsgleichnisse*, 183.
[69] Weiser, *Knechtsgleichnisse*, 188.
[70] Weiser, *Knechtsgleichnisse*, 188-193.

ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ᾗ οὐ προσδοκᾷ (24:50a) does not then mean 'sooner than he expected'. It approximates to the sense of Mt 24:4: 'on a day he does not know'; ἐν ὥρᾳ ᾗ οὐ γινώσκει (24:50b).

In view of this, Bornkamm is right to argue that the discourse is concerned with the delay of the Parousia, in the sense that, between the reader and the End, Matthew has introduced events which make 'Wisdom' in Mt 24:45ff a matter of behaving sensibly with a view to the long period ahead. Bornkamm presents 'folly' as the servant's illusion about the Lord's delay; he presents 'Wisdom' in 25:1ff as the experience which confirms the provision which the five wise women made. 'Folly' in Mt 25:1ff is the illusion that he is already at hand.[71] No doubt the emphasis in Mt 24:48 is only marginally different from 25:5 when 24:48 is heard in context, but it is probably more accurate to regard 'Wisdom' and 'folly' as ethically orientated rather then 'delay'-orientated. The wickedness of the servant in Mt 24:49 is that he is opposed to the standards of the coming Son of Man. There is an element of delay present in both 24:48 and 25:5; but the critical issue is that there is a long period ahead, and the time needs to be filled appropriately.

The problem remains as to the precise meaning of 'Parousia delay' in the discussion of these parables. Grässer's classic definition gives 'Parousia delay' the accent of an acute uncertainty; that accent attached itself to the church's expectation as early Christians wrestled with the only form of eschatological hope which Jesus entertained, a hope of near-fulfilment.[72] That acute uncertainty required that the Gospels should offer a justification and explanation of the delay, an explanation of the precise kind which the eschatological parables provide. For Grässer, therefore, χρονίζει is first and foremost a parabolic feature par excellence. It is neither a subsidiary feature of the story, showing the testing circumstances in which the servant in Mt 24:48 has to work, nor even that feature taken up into the church's experience of the Parousia's delay. It represents the church's creative response to the crisis, made through the presentation of a parable which qualifies the expectation of an early day of reckoning.[73]

That early Christians needed to be protected from an immediate expectation of the End in so far as that threatened responsible work and behaviour, is clear from 1 Thess 4:10–5:22, the passage relevant to the discussion of *The Thief*. It is also clear from the Thessalonian context that

---

[71] Bornkamm expressed his conclusion in this form during his 1960 lectures on Matthew.

[72] Grässer, *Problem*, 16ff.

[73] Grässer, *Problem*, 86ff; see Gollinger, *Auslegung*, 238ff; Feuillet, *Synthèse*, 70; Dupont, *Apocalypses*.

the death of Christians before the Parousia, if not an acute problem, was a deeply poignant one,[74] requiring comfort and guidance.

The tradition of the parable of *The Two Servants* suggests that behind Matthew there are forms which did not necessarily refer to a Parousia delay. They were concerned with corrections to the disturbing and dangerous aspects of near-expectation. The pre-Lucan Q collection, with its Beatitudes, holds out the promise of reward to those who stay the course; the pre-Matthean Q collection interprets 'watching' in terms of obedience, as well as, as will become evident later, offering advice on the pastoral problems of death before the Parousia. In neither case need χρονίζει ὁ κύριος have referred to a crisis of 'delay'; it need only have referred to an extension of time before the Parousia. Indeed that phrase in the parable of *The Two Servants* probably referred to a delay in the Lord's return only because it had been linked with 25:5.

The wider questions raised by Grässer cannot be dealt with here in full. A study of the Matthean parables as a whole does however raise serious questions against the 'delay-crisis' theology which Grässer propounded; the background to the Matthean redaction which is emerging in the course of this study cannot be forced into that narrow mould. Similarly the diachronic and synchronic evidence on parable plots has indicated that temporal references form a natural part of these plots which too strong an eschatological emphasis would distort.

3) The 'ecclesiological' background to redaction.

There are four distinct elements within the redaction which have been classified as ecclesiological. First, Luke's version of the parable is introduced by a Petrine question (Lk 12:41). The absence of this in Matthew has caused comment.[75] Is it omitted by Matthew because the parable reflects unfavourably on church officials? Does it suggest that Peter was associated with the church officials criticized within it? Whether the parable concerns church officials must be considered in a moment, but, apart from the traditio-historical difficulties involved in attempting to show that Matthew, the redactor, knew the Lucan form of the story prefaced by a Petrine question, it cannot be said that Matthew's Gospel protects Peter from criticism.

Second, there are the relationships depicted within the parable which might be suggestive of inner-church relationships. Four elements, the quotation of Ps 103(104):27, the use of καθιστάναι and συνδοῦλος (see Mt 18:31), Luke's choice of οἰκονόμος, and the Beatitude on a responsible individual, all illustrate possible references to church leaders. In association

[74] Collins, *Tradition*, 330-331.
[75] Weiser, *Knechtsgleichnisse*, 201ff.

with the parable of *The Talents* however, several of these illustrations point in the reverse direction; they become strong evidence against the association of the parable directly with an authorized leadership group. In *The Talents*, a parable with vocabulary closely related to that of *The Two Servants*, it is the full range of human responsibility which is under review, and not just leadership responsibilities.

Attempts have been made in other parts of Matthew, notably in Mt 18, to identify the structure of authority within the Sitz im Leben of Matthew's Gospel. But while responsible persons within the activity of the Matthean churches can be identified, a single structure of authority cannot, and it may well be part of Matthew's purpose to present a Gospel which recognizes a range of different forms of authority. The interest in inner-church relationships is a different matter.[76] The use of συνδοῦλος hints at an important cross-reference which incorporates social relationships into responsible behaviour. It is a further indication that, while it is often correct to treat the level of narrative and the level of interpretation as separate, some parables, including this one, suggest a close interrelationship between the levels of narration and interpretation. That such inner-church relationships include responsibilities is to be taken for granted. But the perspective presented in the parable may be wider than that. It includes inner-church relationships, but social and economic relationships as well.

Third, there is the use of διχοτομήσει (Mt 24:51/Lk 12:46). This has been regarded as a disciplinary term, particulary because of the work of Betz on Qumran parallels. As a disciplinary term, found in Q, it could be used metaphorically of God's future judgment, cursing and excluding the disobedient, or of God's future judgment as the only authority rightly exercising that function. As a literal reference to royal anger, the Greek word could describe violence, parallel to the events in a parable ascribed to the Amoraic rabbi Simeon ben Lakish (Pes R 15:4):

> When he (the king) grew angry at the first, he seized
> a stick and struck him, and the son shuddered and died.

As a mistranslation of an Aramaic original, διχοτομήσει could represent the idea of 'separate' or 'beat' or 'halve',[77] but none of these is satisfactory. In the Matthean tradition the reference, if not the picture, is clear. God will separate him, as the bad is separated from that which is good, and his punishment will be to share the fate of the ὑποκριτῶν. The pain and the anguish of this eschatological fate (see Mt 24:51c) adds a further aspect to

[76] Beare, *Apocalypse*, 112ff.
[77] Betz, *Matthew 24,51*, 43-58; Goulder, *Midrash*, 437 n.24.

the separation. For such a context Betz's solution is particularly appropriate.[78] 1 QS 2:16 refers to a double punishment:

ונכרת מתוך כול בני אור יתן גורלו בתוך ארורי עולמים

There is the separation similar to that in Mt 13:47-50. The act of rejection belongs to the Final Judgment, and not before. Whether this limits the church's disciplinary activities, excluding (for example) all form of cursing and anathematizing, is not clear; perhaps the lack of clarity is intentional. One further possible solution brings together the separation motif, the disciplinary punishment and the reference to hypocrites; it is to assume for διχοτομήσει a Danielic background; see Susanna 55 and 59. This could be, as will appear later, a useful alternative solution.

Fourth, Matthew uses the term ὑποκριτῶν.[79] The word picks up features of the parable: the servant accepts responsibility, but 'in his heart' (Mt 24:48) plans to misuse it; his misuse of it involves others; ὑποκριτῶν and διχοτομήσει have a common field of reference, a field of reference which, to judge by 1 QS 2:11-17, includes both insincere intention and the causing of others to stumble (Mt 13:14). In Matthew's Gospel as a whole, 'hypocrites' are those who look for human approbation in the service of God's glory (Mt 6:2,5,16), those who judge others without corresponding self-criticism (Mt 7:5), and those who pervert the teaching of the divine way into a human tradition (Mt 15:7). This last aspect of Matthean use harmonizes with an important feature of the Judaic word field of חנף; it can refer to a false approach to Law. It links with Qumran and rabbinic usage, with the charge against the scribes and Pharisees in Mt 23,[80] and with the false teachers in 1 Tim 4:1-2.

Again, the word could refer specifically to leaders. Minear[81] describes hypocrisy as entailing 'a defalcation of responsibility'. Analysing the audiences within which that meaning would be appropriate, Minear concludes that the synagogue leaders could serve as an object lesson for church leaders. However, Minear's audience identification is faulty,[82] and it is likely that the word attacks all whose interpretation of the Law excludes the interpretation of Jesus (see 22:46–23:39). Concern with integrity and inner motives are to be included within this general definition; those qualities are of the utmost importance for Matthew. But the hypocrite is one

---

78 Betz, *Matthew 24,51*, 45.
79 Weiser, *Knechtsgleichnisse*, 201.
80 Garland, *Matthew 23*, 96 n.20.
81 Minear, *False Prophecy*, 76ff.
82 Minear, *Disciples*; Jones, *Matthew 18*, 325ff.

who fails to understand the nature of obedience to God, and obedience comprehends integrity, motives and action.

This is a conclusion of some importance, since it provides further evidence that Matthew's debates may well overlap with those of current Judaism. One of the issues of the day was the harmony between intentions and actions.[83] That is one of a network of features in *The Two Servants*. The parable contrasts reward and punishment, obedience and disobedience, and threatens the disobedient with the fate of the ungodly at the Last Day and the curse of final separation. Such a network could be the work of the final redactor. But probably it belongs to a far earlier, pre-Matthean stage.

(iii) *The Tradition*

The eschatological 'Servant' parables have, as Weiser indicates,[84] several similarities: they deal with a lord who departs, giving responsibilities to his servants until his return; this is a trial period, either in the sense that the time of the lord's return is uncertain (Mk 13:33-37; Lk 12:35-38), or because the responsibilities have to be exercised in the interim (Mt 24:45-51/Lk 12:42-46; Mt 25:14-30/Lk 19:12-27); his return determines whether they deserve reward or punishment, and his arrival is either a judgment in itself or leads to a time of reckoning. In the case of *The Two Servants* the question which is normally asked is to what original audience would the parable have been suited: to the disciples, warning them of judgment, to Israel's leaders, or to a general audience? Despite the superficial appearance of balancing halves in the parable, the second half does not entirely correspond to the first, and lacks the signs of an authentic background. The first half may well be original, corresponding to the eschatological promises in Mt 19:28/Lk 22:28 and reflecting the historical warnings of Jesus that judgment will fall on Israel's leaders and that others will take her place; the second half may well be its counterpoint, produced in the 'Wisdom' tradition of the Q material. At that stage the metaphor of 'servants' corresponded to the metaphors in Mt 7:9; 11:11; 12:11; Lk 15:4. Slaves have no choice, and Wisdom, as Pirke Aboth 1:3 records, means obedience.[85]

The distinctiveness of the original rests on individual and corporate accountability before God, or, more precisely, on the radical call of God to follow his way (as in Mt 6:24/Lk 16:13, a proverbial saying paralleled in Plutarch, *Moralia*, 180B), for which the reward is a greater responsibility still (as in the parable of *The Talents*). Only at the stage of the Matthean and Lucan Q versions did this saying become a Parousia parable. When it

---

[83] Neusner, *Tarphon*.

[84] Weiser, *Knechtsgleichnisse*, 123ff.

[85] Viviano, *Study as Worship*, 8; Flusser, *Gleichnisse*, 142ff.

was grouped with other Parousia parables, it provided a warning not to slacken, as the days before the Parousia continued.

As distinct from these 'reward' parables, there were the 'crisis' parables. These too became Parousia parables as the eschatological context gave their metaphors new currency (as in the case of *The Thief*). So the present similarities between the Parousia parables, as identified by Marshall and others[86] and traced to the historical Jesus, may belong to the stage of their incorporation into eschatological groupings. Previous to that, their styles, their forms and, to some extent, the use of their pictures were different.

(iv–v) *The History of the Parables and the History of Redaction*

This parable shows signs of a parallel process to that which resulted in the Matthean form of the parable of *The Two Houses*. The style, organization, contrasts and balances are the same. Their difference lies in the shape of the material from which they were created. The character of the eschatological tradition behind the parables of Matthew is now clear. The Jesus parables expressed the authoritative challenge and warning of Jesus to individuals and the Jerusalem leaders. The radical accountability before God to which Jesus summoned everyone emerged in powerful pictures, similitudes, narratives and apocalyptic visions. These developed into warnings to the Early Church, especially as the emphasis on near-expectation grew and apocalyptic revelations reinforced the power of the Parousia message. As a response to this emphasis, and as the years went by, eschatological discourse developed the pictures and parables by which to express a powerful concern: standards of obedience are to be maintained in the days before the Parousia. Matthew inherited such a body of material. It provided complementary material to the Marcan outline in Mark 13 and increasingly was shaped as Wisdom teaching. This enabled the writer of Matthew to establish an extended collection of parabolic material which could be summarized and brought to a climax in the final parable. There the world-wide mission which characterizes the life of the church was shown by the redactor in a new perspective. It is a mission characterized by the standards of obedience which derive from the Son's revelation and shaped by the nature of the Son of Man's authority. The form in which those standards are being presented is that of Parousia parables; they emphasize what Lambrecht calls 'the active, laborious, responsible service' which 'watching' entails.[87] But over and beyond the immediate responsibility of individual Christians and the Christian community stands a new vision of God's will and purpose revealed in his Son as the basis of a world-wide mission.

---

[86] Marshall, *Parables*.

[87] Lambrecht, *Parousia*, 328; see also *Treasure*, 189-198.

D. *The Ten Young Women* Mt 25:1-13

(i) *The Context*

This is the third of the group of parables in Matthew's form of Q. The designation 'Matthean Q' is of course hypothetical, but has much in its favour.[88] The end of the parable, Mt 25:10-11, contains parallels with two sections of Q material,[89] Mt 25:10-11/Lk 12:35-36 and Mt 25:10/Lk 13:25. The first of these has already been mentioned in relation to the Lucan collection of parables in Lk 12:35-48, where it occurs with *The Thief* and *The Servant*. The association of Mt 25:10-11 with *The Thief* and *The Servants* requires explanation, especially in view of vocabulary links between Lk 12:38 and *The Thief*, and between Lk 12:37 and *The Servants*.[90]

The correspondence between Mt 25:10 and Lk 13:25 is closer than is the case with Mt 25:10 and Lk 12:36: twelve exact agreements of words, often of forms and in the same order as well.[91] The context of Lk 13:25 in the Lucan order contains material used in Matthew at the end of the Sermon on the Mount and the beginning of the Sermon's narrative sequel.[92] It was argued above that Matthew followed this order as it had already been incorporated into the Matthean Sermon,[93] continuing from the eschatological form of *The Two Houses*, via the traditional summary, into the narrative healings. The omission of Lk 13:25 from that context calls for explanation,[94] particularly as the development of the Sermon on the Mount can be traced through an extension of the logion Lk 6:46/Mt 7:21, which overlaps with the κύριε of Lk 13:25 and 26.[95] It is not a sufficient explanation[96] to regard Mt 7:22 as a redactional replacement for Lk 13:25; if

---

[88] See ch. 1. Weder, *Gleichnisse,* 240 and n.144; Schenk, *Auferweckung*, 283ff.

[89] Weiser, *Knechtsgleichnisse*, 163ff.

[90] Weiser, *Knechtsgleichnisse*, 167ff.

[91] The comparison can be set out as follows:

Mt 25:10	Lk 13:25
	ἀφ' οὗ ἐγερθῇ ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης
καὶ ἐκλείσθη ἡ θύρα	καὶ ἀποκλείσῃ τὴν θύραν
	καὶ ἄρξησθε ἔξω ἑστάναι καὶ
λέγουσαι	κρούειν τὴν θύραν λέγοντες
κύριε κύριε ἄνοιξον ἡμῖν	κύριε κύριε ἄνοιξον ἡμῖν
ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν	καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ἐρεῖ ὑμῖν
ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν	
οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς.	οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς πόθεν ἐστέ.

[92] Lk 13:22-24=Mt 7:13-14; Lk 13:26=Mt 7:22; Lk 13:27-28=Mt 7:22-23; Lk 13:29=Mt 8:11; Lk 13:27b=Mt 8:12.

[93] p.364.

[94] Schenk, *Auferweckung*, 283 n.29.

[95] See the continuity provided by Mt 7:13-14=Lk 13:23-24.

[96] Pace Schenk, *Auferweckung*, 284.

Matthew possessed Lk 13:25-27 as part of that source, this would mean that Matthew transformed[97] the act of disownment οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς (Lk 13:26) in 7:23 but not in 25:10. The text in Mt 7:23 οὐδέποτε ἔγνων ὑμᾶς makes it preferable to suppose a different tradition history for 7:21-23 from that of 25:10[98] despite the fact that they both concern the disowning of disciples who say 'Lord, lord'. The unusual construction of Lk 13:25 could further support the case for a unique tradition history for this logion.[99]

The ending of the parable is probably pre-Matthean, and may be termed Q material because of its association with the parables of *The Thief* and *The Servants*. There is also one further unquestionably pre-Matthean element in the parable: ἐκάθευδον in 25:5.[100] In a Matthean context stressing γρηγορεῖτε (24:42; 25:13),[101] the acceptance by the bridegroom of those who went to sleep is a contradiction of the first order.[102] The subject of 'sleep' has however already appeared in the context of *The Thief*, where 1 Thess 4:10–5:22 was used as early evidence for pastoral concern about 'those who fall asleep' before the Parousia. Other common elements between 1 Thess 4:10–5:22 and Mt 25:1-13 are: φωνή 4:1/κραυγή Mt 25:6;[103] εἰς ἀπάντησιν τοῦ κυρίου 4:17/εἰς ὑπάντησιν τοῦ νυμφίου Mt 25:1 and εἰς ἀπάντησιν[104] Mt 25:6; σὺν κυρίῳ 4:17; 5:10/μετ' αὐτοῦ Mt 25:10; γρηγορῶμεν 5:6/γρηγορεῖτε Mt 25:13; νυκτός 5:5,7/Mt 25:6.[105] It is possible that the pre-Matthean form of the parable was about the 'afterlife'. Indeed the whole parable as it stands could be read as an affirmation of the role of good works in the 'afterlife', taking ἔλαιον as symbolic for 'good works',[106] perhaps with a warning against vicarious merit (τοὺς πωλοῦντας).[107] There are difficulties when the whole parable is read in that way. The difficulties vary in importance: not so serious is that

---

[97] For the textual problems here, see Marshall, *Luke*, 566-567. For the relation of this denial to 25:31ff, see Ford, *Foolish Scholars*, 117.

[98] 7:21ff owed its form to the Sermon on the Mount tradition (see Davies, *Sermon*, 398ff) and 25:10 to the development of the parabolic triplet: *The Thief*, *The Servants*, *The Ten Young Women*.

[99] For a detailed consideration of this, see Marshall, *Luke*, 565ff.

[100] p.312 n.111.

[101] p.430 n.29

[102] Goulder, *Midrash*, 439; For a discussion of the discrepancy, see Lövestam, *Wakefulness*, 121 n.4.

[103] For φωνή as the archangel's summons, see Harnisch, *Existenz*, 44ff; for κραυγή as an eschatological cry as well as a marker of time within the narrative, see Linnemann, *Parables*, 193 n.8; Strobel, *Mat.XXV,1-13*, 206ff.

[104] See Lövestam, *Wakefulness*, 112ff.

[105] See Mk 13:35 and Strobel, *Mat.XXV,1-13*, 223, and in reply Weder, *Gleichnisse*, 241 n.154.

[106] Feldman, *Parables*, 165ff.

[107] Derrett, *Parabola*, 137ff.

ἕτοιμοι[108] in Mt 24:44 means 'ready and equipped for the coming of the Son of Man', whereas the same word in Mt 25:10 would then mean 'equipped to accompany the bridegroom', but more serious is that γρηγορεῖτε and νυκτός would sound strange alongside ἐκάθευδον, since the two former words fit a context of a struggle, and the latter one a context of peace and tranquillity. Released from its context in Mt 24:42 and Mt 25:13, the parable could, if it already included the Q material (Mt 25:10-12), be read alongside the other two Q parables, as a response to the pastoral problems posed by those who 'fall asleep' before the Parousia.

For this to be a clue to the origin of Mt 25:1-13, and an explanation of why Matthew retained *The Thief* and *The Servants* along with 25:1-13, the language, style and construction of the parable would have to be pre-Matthean. To what extent is that true? The answer must be given by redaction-critical study.

(ii) *The Redaction*

Wolfgang Schenk and Armand Puig i Tàrrech[109] have provided the most detailed redaction-critical survey of this parable so far. Schenk concludes that the original parable read as follows:

1) δέκα παρθένοι [μετὰ τῶν λαμπάδων] ἑαυτῶν ἐξῆλθον εἰς ὑπάντησιν τοῦ νυμφίου.
2) πέντε ἐξ αὐτῶν (5) [ἐνύσταξαν καὶ] ἐκάθευδον.
6) μέσης νυκτὸς κραυγὴ γέγονεν, ἰδοὺ ὁ νυμφίος, ἐξερχεσθε εἰς ἀπάντησιν.
7) ἠγέρθησαν αἱ παρθένοι ἐκεῖναι καὶ ἐκόσμησαν τὰς λαμπάδας ἑαυτῶν.
10) ἦλθεν ὁ νυμφίος καὶ [πᾶσαι] αἱ παρθένοι εἰσῆλθον εἰς τοὺς γάμους.

The point of the parable in that form is that even the dead are woken by the cry which heralds that Last Judgment, so that, as in 1 Thess 4:10ff, all believers, whether dead or alive at the final hour, share in the Kingdom.[110] In this form, Schenk argues, the parable is entirely appropriate to the Sitz im Leben of Jesus, as the debate with the Sadducees illustrates (Mk 12:18-27): death cannot challenge the Kingdom's power.[111]

---

[108] On the form (except in the Uncial MS A), unusual in Matthean adjectival usage, see Blass, Debrunner, Funk, *Grammar* §59; also Schenk, *Auferweckung*, 282 n.20.

[109] Schenk, *Auferweckung*; Puig i Tàrrech, *Dix Vièrges*.

[110] Schenk, *Auferweckung*, 294.

[111] Schenk, *Auferweckung*, 297.

To this parable, continues Schenk,[112] Matthew adds the Q material (vv11-12), the introductory material (vv1 and 4), and the moral distinction between the two groups, thereby showing that lack of good works makes a mockery of salvation; those who simply say 'Lord, lord' will find themselves excluded. A good supply of acts of righteousness, on the other hand, makes the Final Judgment a time of joy.

Schenk's theory can be tested by a verse-by-verse analysis. The same applies to Puig i Tàrrech's solution, although his argument is more complex.[113] He recognizes that no generally agreed history of the parable has proved possible. Some have treated it as unauthentic (either as allegory: Bornkamm, Grässer, Strobel, Donfried, T.W. Manson; or as 'Parabel': Linnemann), others as authentic (with different eschatological nuances: concerning a judgment: Michaelis, Kümmel, Meinertz; a sudden catastrophe: C.H. Dodd; or with an emphasis on God's decision or on human choice: Weder, Aurelio, Lambrecht, Maisch; or based on the Song of Songs: Feuillet, Ford, Derrett). Puig i Tàrrech suggests an alternative approach: we should be guided by the movement of the narration in Mt 25:1-13; this can be monitored by means of the adverbial signals in vv5,6,10 and 11 and by the Tenses and Particles. The narrative movement offers two important insights into the history of the parable: first, that in its present form the narrative has five scenes; second, that scenes 2 (vv5-6) and 5 (vv11-13) are episodic and do not belong to its original form. Scene 2 slows the plot, clouding the issue by classing the ten young women as a unit, by introducing the reference to sleep and by defining the folly of the five as a failure to reckon with the bridegroom's delay, a factor to which Scene 5 corresponds. The authentic parable (Scenes 1, 3 and 4) can thus be identified: the original parable concentrated on the task of the 'bridegroom's maids of honour' as Galilean wedding practice defined it, and on the dialogue in Scene 3 (with its strong hints of Aramaisms). The dialogue made the task impossible for the foolish five, thus shifting the parable into the metaphoric process and confronting the hearers with the radical character of discipleship.

Some of Puig i Tàrrech's insights are invaluable. He correctly identifies the key to the narrative; it is the task of the 'maids of honour' to carry their flaming torches in the welcome procession for the bridegroom, a task at which some fail and others succeed. He also correctly identifies the importance of the dialogue in vv8-9, although the significance of the dialogue is by no means as clear as he suggests. He supports his analysis with a verse-by-verse study of the language of the parable, but this has several weaknesses, as will appear from the discussion below: one weakness

---

112 Schenk, *Auferweckung*, 286ff.

113 Puig i Tàrrech, *Dix Vièrges.*

is its lack of reference to the theory of an epic style in Mt 25:1-13; another is the ambiguity of his findings: some are based on source-critical criteria and some on linguistic criteria, giving the impression that the case for all of vv5 and 11-13 as secondary is stronger than in fact it is. He arrives at the following summary:

Bold indicates what is redactional in origin and form;
Underlining indicates what is redactional in form, non-redactional in origin;
Absence of line indicates what the redactor has not touched;
Broken lines indicate uncertainty about redactional or primitive origin;
Double upright bars indicate traditional material.

1) τότε ὁμοιωθήσεται ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν δέκα παρθένοις, αἵτινες λαβοῦσαι τὰς λαμπάδας ἑαυτῶν **ἐξῆλθον εἰς ὑπάντησιν** τοῦ νυμφίου.
2) πέντε δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν **ἦσαν** /μωραὶ/ καὶ πέντε /φρόνιμοι/.
3) **αἱ γὰρ** /μωραὶ/ λαβοῦσαι τὰς λαμπάδας οὐκ ἔλαβον μεθ' ἑαυτῶν ἔλαιον.
4) **αἱ δὲ** /φρόνιμοι/ ἔλαβον ἔλαιον ἐν τοῖς ἀγγείοις μετὰ τῶν λαμπάδων ἑαυτῶν.
5) —
6) /μέσης **δὲ** νυκτὸς/ κραυγὴ γέγονεν· ἰδοὺ ὁ νυμφίος ἐξέρχεσθε εἰς ἀπάντησιν αὐτοῦ.
7) **τότε πᾶσαι αἱ** παρθένοι ἐκόσμησαν τὰς λαμπάδας ἑαυτῶν.
8) αἱ δὲ /μωραὶ/ ταῖς φρονίμοις εἶπαν· δότε ἡμῖν ἐκ τοῦ ἐλαίου ὑμῶν, ὅτι αἱ λαμπάδες ἡμῶν σβέννυνται.
9) ἀπεκρίθησαν **δὲ αἱ** /φρόνιμοι/ λέγουσαι· μήποτε οὐκ ἀρκέσῃ ἡμῖν καὶ ὑμῖν· πορεύεσθε καὶ ἀγοράσατε ἑαυταῖς.
10) ἀπερχομένων **δὲ** αὐτῶν ἦλθεν ὁ νυμφίος καὶ αἱ ἕτοιμοι εἰσῆλθον μετ' αὐτῶν εἰς τοὺς γάμους.

Analysis: Section A. The Setting
v1 ὁμοιωθήσεται. Similar sequences to this formula are found in other traditions (Puig i Tàrrech, 165). The Future Passive of this Verb is found elsewhere at 7:2. If, however, 7:24,26 is pre-Matthean on the grounds of the doublet, the Future Passive of this Verb need not necessarily be redactional either in form or in origin.

αἵτινες λαβοῦσαι. Although the parabolic introduction could be treated as redactional,[114] this phrase probably should not. There are several different

[114] Maisch, *Jungfrauen*, 255f; Schenk, *Auferweckung*, 290.

factors relevant to the decision. There is no other Matthean example of a Participle following ὅστις,[115] and the examples of a Participle following ὅς, as in Mt 24:46/Lk 12:43, have Q associations;[116] the Q examples include the Aorist Participle of λαμβάνω. See Mt 13:31 Par Lk/Diff Mk; Mt 13:33 Par Lk. The Verb λαμβάνω is a classic case of a Verb which is often treated as redactional, but the evidence is not entirely clear and a decision here depends on a general theory regarding Matthean style: the uses of the Aorist Participle of λαμβάνω are probably best classified as a feature of the homogenizing style identified by Hartman (See Mt 27:48 Diff Mk; Mt 27:59 Diff Mk; Mt 25:20 Diff Lk; Mk 9:36 Diff Mt; Lk 6:4 Diff Mk; Lk 20:29 Diff Mk; Lk 24:30,43 No Par).[117]

τότε. This Matthean habit is nowhere else used as the introduction to a parable.[118] It is possible that τότε here relates to τότε in 25:31, but, as in the case of 18:23, the origin and function of introductory Particles are difficult to define.[119]

λαμπάδας. Jeremias has made the case for a distinctive use of this term here.[120] It cannot be explained by reference to Q material, as Lk 12:35 uses λύχνοι. Whether it means, as Jeremias suggests, 'torches', or 'lamps'[121] or 'lanterns on poles', the usage is distinctive and unexpected. It may well refer to wood batons, their ends bound with material to absorb combustible liquids. Schwarz suggests that שׁשׁיתא is one example of many Aramaic equivalents in this parable beginning with ש but this theory founders on the alternative translation possibilities in vv8-9 and, at present, the absence of near-contemporary evidence for his preferences.[122] λαμπάδες may have gained special associations through use in worship (Acts 20:9), as they did eventually at the Easter Vigil.[123]

---

115 p.175 n.3.
116 p.275 n.332 (v).
117 λαμβάνω
Schenk, 331; Gundry, 645; Neirynck, 386; Bergemann, 112, 116.
Mt 53x: 24x No Par; 13x Par Mk; 2x Par Lk; 10x Diff Mk; 4x Diff Lk
Mk 20x: 13x Par Mt; 5x Diff Mt; 1x >*Mt; 1x >
Lk 22x: 8x No Par; 7x Par Mk; 2x Par Mt; 4x Diff Mk; 1x Text?
See also p.477 n.228 (3).
118 See p.232 n. 205 (iv).
119 Jones, *Matthew 18*, 80-98.
120 Jeremias, Λάμπαδες, 196-201.
121 Linnemann, *Parables*, 124.
122 Schwarz, *Vokabular*, 270 n.4; Lamsa, *Evangelien*, 190; Lövestam, *Wakefulness*, 114.
123 Strobel, *Mat.XXV,1-13*, 213 n.3.

ἑαυτῶν. The Reflexive Pronoun in last position is found in Matthew 3x here and at 18:31 and in Luke 4x No Par and 3x Diff Mt. A review of Reflexive Pronouns in the Synoptics confirms that this use is unusual in Matthew. On the only occasion ἑαυτῶν is used Diff Mk it is in first position (Mt 21:8 Diff Mk).[124]

ἐξῆλθον εἰς is nowhere used editorially in Matthew.[125] Jeremias[126] suggests that the Verb is a situation-setter parallel to Mt 22:2, rather than the first act of the drama. Jülicher,[127] followed by Schenk,[128] finds it more appropriate to link the Verb with Mt 25:6, and regards the intervening verses as breaking the sequence of action. If this is an epic parable, Jeremias's judgment of style is likely to be correct.

ὑπάντησιν is a variation on ἀπάντησιν, of the kind frequent in epic parables. The appearance of ἀπάντησιν in 1 Thess 4:17 may suggest that the phrase belongs with a pre-Matthean stage of the parable, or its royal associations may give a Hellenistic colouring to the parable; or it is parallel to a formula well attested in the Old Testament, in its versions, and in the New Testament (see Acts 28:15), with both positive and negative connotations.[129]

δέκα παρθένοις. παρθένοι may well go back to a Semitic original indicating young women of an age to marry who are invited to perform the function of 'maids of honour'. The number ten is numerically and representatively symbolic.[130]

νυμφίου is found in the Synoptics only in two contexts: here and in Mk 2:19f and parallels. The Matthean 'wedding' motif in Mt 22:1ff and 25:1ff has been categorized by Nolan[131] as a sub-motif of kingship. The climax of Matthew 25 gives this judgment further cogency; as a fresh approach to νυμφίου it illustrates the way in which this image, like others treated earlier, was given richer resonances by Matthew. Nevertheless νυμφίου is not so much the central character in the parabolic action as the one who sets it in motion.[132]

---

124 Schenk, *Auferweckung*, 391.
125 See p.293.
126 Jeremias, Λάμπαδες, 199.
127 Jülicher, *Gleichnisreden*, 448.
128 Schenk, *Auferweckung*, 294f.
129 See Arndt and Gingrich, 79.
130 Flusser, *Gleichnisse*, 186f; Burkitt, *Ten Virgins*, 268.
131 Nolan, *Son*, 194; see 2 Sam 17:3.
132 On the text, see Metzger, *Commentary*, 62.

Schenk sees a chiastic relation between v1 and v13. The exhaustive study of chiastic arrangements published by Di Marco[133] does not include this, yet finds chiastic arrangements in practically every book of the Bible, concluding with good reason that this is an extremely general phenomenon and by no means to be classified as a sign of Matthean redaction. The inner structure of this parable is not chiastic.[134]

Conclusion on v1: v1 is probably not to be classified as redactional. The second half of the verse shows non-Matthean signs of order, vocabulary and structure.

v2 πέντε ἐξ αὐτῶν. Numbers are accompanied by a bewildering variety of constructions, all of which have been analysed redaction-critically. On that basis it would be extremely unwise to judge that this is not a piece of tradition.[135]

μωραὶ...φρόνιμοι. The background of these two words traced earlier[136] is so firmly within the Wisdom tradition that even if they had been introduced by the editor into this parable their inclusion would have classifiable as traditional rather than Matthean. Coming immediately after a φρόνιμος/κακός parable, parallel in style and content to 7:24-7, the use here is likely to be pre-Matthean.

ἦσαν. It is unwise to consider this as redactional. That is inappropriate both for the verbal form and for its associated syntax.[137] The style of v2 is succinct, without a wasted word. The rhythm is 10:6.

Conclusion on v2: v2 is epic in style. There is no more reason to classify its syntax or Wisdom features as editorial than is the case in 7:24-27.

v3 λαβοῦσαι...ἔλαβον. Schenk and Puig i Tàrrech note the use of λαμβάνω again.[138] But the strong assonance and alliteration in itself could have commended the use of the Verb: ἔλαβον/ἔλαιον. Apart from this, the simplicity of the language is typical of the form. Schenk quotes Schlatter and Jeremias[139] in support of the view that the Aorist Participle and the

133 Di Marco, *Chiasmus*, 53ff.
134 Sellin, *Gleichnisstrukturen*, 97.
135 Jones, *Matthew 18*, 141f.
136 See p.180 n.11 (ii).
137 Pace Puig i Tàrrech.
138 Schenk, *Auferweckung*, 290; Puig i Tàrrech, *Dix Vièrges*, 167f.
139 Schenk, *Auferweckung*, 290 n.57.

Aorist Verb describing a single action is a Matthean characteristic. Those studies were, however, complete before Hartman's work on the Matthean Participle. The construction is typical of the narrative parable in Luke. Nowhere else in Matthew are the Aorist Participle and the Aorist Verb from the same Simple Verb coupled together. This means that the repetition of the epic style introduces a virtual quotation from v1 into v3, typically (for the epic style) with the Reflexive Pronoun omitted.

μεθ' ἑαυτῶν. μετά + the Genitive of accompanying persons is claimed by Schenk as very frequent in Matthew. Puig i Tàrrech also regards it as redactional.[140] But the statistics show that it is frequent in Mark and Luke also, and the patterns of phrases indicating accompanying persons alternate between the Synoptics, so that very few examples can be established as without doubt redactional. That this very phrase could simply be omitted by Matthew is demonstrated by Mk 9:8 >*Mt (see also Mk 14:33 >*Mt).[141]

γάρ explains the difference between the groups. The general statistics indicate no clear redactional pattern and the parabolic uses suggest that it is typical of the Greek epic parable to use Particles with meticulous care.[142] The rhythm of v3 is 11:11.

v4 shuffles the phrases once more, bringing ἔλαβον/ἔλαιον together in a series of -ον endings (concluding with the distinctive final ἑαυτῶν) and adding only ἐν τοῖς ἀγγείοις. Schwarz's suggested retranslation of ἀγγεῖον into the Aramaic אשש[143] is not as yet attested for Middle Palestinian Aramaic, and the Greek word ἀγγεῖον is widely used, in classical and Hellenistic texts, and in the LXX (see Gen 43:11, where the

---

[140] Schenk, *Auferweckung*, 290f; Puig i Tàrrech, *Dix Vièrges*, 179.

[141] μετά + Genitive. See p.231 n.205 (iii). All of the Matthean uses are Genitive of Accompaniment except the following:

Mt 13x: 5x No Par; 2x Par Mk; 2x Par Lk; 3x Diff Mk; 1x No Par or Diff Lk. In the case of five of the Mk Diff Mt, Matthew has ἀκολουθέω (Diff Mk 5:24), the Dative (Diff Mk 6:50), λαβεῖν (Diff Mk 8:14), ἐπὶ + Genitive (Diff Mk 14:62), καὶ (Diff Mk 15:1; with the reverse at Mt 22:16 Diff Mk). In the case of the Mk >*Mt, all nine are Genitive of Accompaniment.

[142] γὰρ Schenk, 123-124; Gundry, 642; Neirynck, 225; Bergemann, 74ff.

Mt 124x: 45x No Par; 27x Par Mk; 17x Par Lk; 22x Diff Mk; 11x Diff Lk; 2x Text?

Mk 64x 27x Par Mt; 8x Diff Mt; 5x > Mt; 23x > ; 1x Text?

Lk 97x: 40x No Par; 19x Par Mk; 17x Par Mt; 9x Diff Mk; 10x Diff Mt; 1x Diff Mk or Diff Mt; 1x Text?

[143] Schwarz, *Vokabular*, 272.

phrase is used with a Genitive Personal Pronoun, as here).[144] The position of λαμπάδων at the conclusion of this verse is an attractive piece of resumptive narrative. Twice the torches have been mentioned early in the sentence; now they are a familiar feature and provide a point at which the narrative reaches its first major pause.

The emphasis on λαμπάδες produced by repetition and order draws further attention to its symbolic possibilities. The associations of 'light'[145] characterize these representative groups. The very simple stylization of the personnel carrying the torches makes that which they take with them all the more significant. The placing of ἔλαιον at the end of 25:3 has a similar effect; ἔλαιον can have associations of light,[146] of law,[147] of good deeds,[148] perhaps perfumed for wedding use,[149] or symbolic of the spreading influence of goodness and righteousness. The style is epic and the rhythm of v4 is 11:14.

Conclusion on vv3 and 4. These two verses represent an epic style with a pre-Matthean order of words, construction and, probably, pre-Matthean vocabulary.

Analysis: Section B. The Central Action
v5 χρονίζοντος. It is unsatisfactory to argue that the Genitive Absolute is a sign of editorial work.[150] There is at work[151] a homogenizing process, within which the particular characteristics of v5 are as follows: Mt 2x No Par; Lk 1x No Par; 1x Diff Mk; and with the use of the Present Participle in Mt 1x No Par; Lk 1x No Par and 1x Diff Mk. The use of the Genitive Absolute at the beginning of a parabolic section is illustrated by Mt 18:24 within the epic style and by numerous Aesopic fables.[152]

---

144 e.g. Gen 42:24 LXX; Xenophon, *Anabasis*, 6.4.23; *Papyri Graeci Regii Taurinensis* (ed. Peyron) 1.2.6 (second century CE).

145 For the negative and positive aspect of this, see Lövestam, *Wakefulness*, 117f.

146 Feldman, *Parables*, 164.

147 Feldman, *Parables*, 165.

148 Feldman, *Parables*, 166.

149 Feldman, *Parables*, 167f.

150 See Appendix.

151 See Appendix.

152 *Cor Fab Aesop* 197 Line 2; 204 Line 4; 205 Line 3; 207 Line 5; 209 Line 3 and passim.

ἐνύσταξαν. The Aorist followed by the Imperfect ἐκάθευδον[153] is ambiguous. It could represent two stages, comparable with a guard who nods, then is fully asleep;[154] or a single stage, indicating continuous but light sleep,[155] or the act of falling asleep and its continuation or manner.[156]

πᾶς as subject, placed between two Verbs, is only found in Matthew in the two passages, 14:20 and 15:37 (where Mark provides the model Mk 6:42). Luke uses it in 8:52 (Diff Mk and Mt) but delays πάντες until after the Verb in his parallel to Mk 6:42 (Lk 9:17). Schenk[157] points out that in v7 πᾶσαι + ἐκεῖναι overfill the sentence; he takes the lack of correspondence between the command in v6c and the section in v7a to suggest that here is an original parable in which all had to rouse themselves (ἐκεῖναι is then Matthean editing), but not all had fallen asleep. Rhythically v5 reads best with πᾶσαι (the syllable count is 9:11; the frequency of the 11-syllable phrase is noteworthy). v7 reads best without ἐκεῖναι; with it the syllable count in the two halves of v7 would be 12:12. Schenk is right to use the phrase 'overfilled'. ἐκεῖναι[158] in post-position in parables is not easily assessed because of text differences (e.g. in v7 it is omitted by D 22 d Co$^{bo\ (1\ MS)}$ Arm; it is in pre-position in a b ff^{1,2} h r ^{1,2} aur). All the synoptic traditions know ἐκεῖνος in post-position, referring to persons previously mentioned. In some texts the evidence for omission should be sustained. Here an editorial addition of ἐκεῖναι could only be supposed if the editor were unaware of the metrical character of narrative. The solution is probably that πᾶσαι is pre-Matthean in v5, and ἐκεῖναι in v7 is a textual gloss. In either case the pattern of Schenk's original parable is destroyed, since according to him everything depends on the assumption that only five fell asleep.

Conclusion on v5: v5 is a pre-Matthean epic parable verse.

v6 μέσης νυκτός Strobel's emphasis on the Passover tradition here is inappropriate.[159] The range of possible symbolic reference is too wide for this to be the only context for the phrase.

---

153 See Donfried, *Ten Virgins*, 417ff.

154 Linnemann, *Parables*, 125.

155 Strobel, *Mat,XXV,1-13*, 175.

156 Lövestam, *Wakefulness*, 113ff, takes the Imperfect as indicating continuation; Fanning, *Verbal Aspects*, 243, provides the best grammatical analysis and distinguishes factual (Aorist) from descriptive (Imperfect) narration.

157 Schenk, *Auferweckung*, 280.

158 For a study of the MS variations, see Jones, *Matthew 18*, 173ff.

159 See p.444 n.105.

κραυγὴ γέγονεν introduces a series of un-Matthean forms: the Narrative Perfect,[160] ἰδοὺ + Noun and an assumed Predicate.[161]

εἰς ἀπάντησιν offers a neat alternative to the parallel phrase in v1. The command is stylized and carries resonances such as Derrett quotes: see Cant 3:7-11 LXX.[162] The rhythm is either 10:6:9 or 10:15, probably the former. The middle section of the parable divides at this point; vv5-6 prepare the way for the central action of the parable: the rising of the young women, and their conversation.

Conclusion on v6: A pre-Matthean, highly dramatic, stylized preparation for the central act.

v7 τότε ἠγερθήσαν. The parabolic use of τότε is found in 13:26; 18:32; 22:13 and Lk 14:9f,21 (No Par or Diff Mt); see also Mt 7:5/Lk 6:42.

ἐγείρω[163] in the Passive Deponent is frequent, particularly as a Participle, for 'rise up', or 'rouse' from sleep (Mt 12:24), but only appears once in the Indicative in that sense: Mt 8:15 Diff Mk. The Aorist Indicative is used of Jesus' resurrection (e.g. Mt 28:6 Par Mk/Par Lk and 28:7 Diff Mk), of being brought back to life (Mt 9:25 with καθεύδει), and of the saints at the resurrection coming from their tombs (Mt 27:52 No Par). In addition to Future uses of 'rising up in judgment' or 'rising up in rebellion', there are three uses alongside νεκροί (Mt 10:8; 11:5; 14:2). In Mk 12:26 Diff Mt, Mark has ἐγείρονται with νεκροί whereas Matthew uses ἀναστάσεως (Diff Mk). In Mt 17:23 and 20:19 ἐγερθήσεται is used of Jesus' rising (Diff Mk and Luke ἀναστήσεται). In the parable here the associations of resurrection could be present behind the simple translation 'got up'.

ἐκόσμησαν is probably an inceptive Aorist: they set themselves to the task of preparing their lamps/torches. The precise action involved is unclear. Schwarz again suggests a late Aramaic word[164] which suggests the nuance of 'smearing' as against the Greek Verb's unsuitability for preparation

---

160 Schenk, *Auferweckung*, 280.
161 See p.427 n.10.
162 Derrett, *Parabola*, I 134.
163 ἐγείρω Schenk, 209f; Gundry, 643; Neirynck, 237, 360.
Mt 36x: 12x No Par; 10x Par Mk; 3x Par Lk; 9x Diff Mk; 2x Diff Lk.
Mk 19x: 10x Par Mt; 1x Diff Mt; 2x >*; 1x > Mt; 4x > ; 1x Text?
Lk 18x: 6x No Par; 3x Par Mt; 8x Par Mk; 1x Diff Mk.
Note: Mt 5x Diff Mk ἀνίστημι; Lk lx Diff Mk ἀνίστημι.
ἐγερθείς Mt 8x: 5x No Par; 1x Par Mk; 2x Diff Mk.
164 Schwarz, *Vokabular*, 273 n.10.

specifically of oil lamps. But, as so often in epic parables, general (not specific) words are used here. κοσμέω means 'arrange' or 'prepare'[165] and this could imply as simple an idea as they got ready their lamps/torches. The rhythm of this verse has been discussed. As it stands, with ἐκεῖναι in the text the syllable count is 15:12. Once again, as in v4, τὰς λαμπάδας ἑαυτῶν appears at the end of the sentence. It gives the narrative the impression of 'home', of a space where the hearer knows where he/she is. It is 'familiar teritory' already, even after only seven verses. The μ-assonance is also noteworthy.

Conclusion on v.7: The simple language is open both to the imagination of the hearer and to the hearer's interpretative awareness. The parable continues in a typically epic style. Only ἐκεῖναι raises any problem.

v.8 αἱ μωραί. The reason becomes apparent here for the unusual order: 'fools'/'wise' (contrast Mt 7:24-27). The fools have to take the initiative. The Nominative and Dative, side by side, present the contrast between the two groups, orally or visually. The only other synoptic context where addresser and addressed both precede the Verb εἶπαν is in the Marcan parable in Mk 12:7; there Matthew does not follow the same pattern (Mt 21:38).

δότε ἐκ is a unique combination within the Synoptic Gospels. The Imperative of δίδωμι and its compound is found in parabolic conversations (Lk15:22,12), and the proximity of Mt 25:28/Lk19:24 is noteworthy.

σβέννυνται. Schenk calls the present linear Indicative redactional,[166] because of its stylistic excellence. It is however possible to regard the Verb as periphrastic, without this further inference. It is a classic example of onomatopoeia. The rhythm of the sentences is 10:11:11.

Conclusion on v8: Without any change of style the parable resumes the contrast of the two groups as a structural element in its formulation.

v9 ἀπεκρίθησαν...λέγουσαι. Our analysis of Hartman's study of the Participle of λέγω confirms his judgment that a process of formularization is at work in Matthew. The analysis of ἀποκρίνομαι, alone and with Verbs of Saying, shows the same pattern.[167]

---

165 Donfried, *Ten Virgins*, 423f.
166 Schenk, *Auferweckung*, 291.
167 Jones, *Matthew 18*, 328; and n.

μὴ πότε οὐ (μὴ) ἀρκέση (εἰ). This is a rare expression with only a partial parallel in Did 4:10 if οὐ μὴ is read in both.[168] If μὴ is not read in Mt 25:9, it still remains an unusual expression: 'it will hardly be enough'.[169] μή is to be read on the grounds of assonance; if it is read, four η vowels appear together.

πορεύεσθε μᾶλλον πρὸς τοὺς πωλοῦντας. There are two strange features here. μᾶλλον may well be an editorial word used by Matthew to underline contrasts, as in Mt 10:28,6. There is some doubt about this because of Mk 15:11 Diff Mt, although the chiastic parallel in Matthew may be pre-Matthean. πρὸς τοὺς πωλοῦντας is a phrase found in Mt 21:12 (2x) and takes the place of available Nouns. The rhythm here is 10:13:20. If the Imperatives only are read, the rhythm is 10:13:13.

Conclusion on v9. There are signs of editorial work in μᾶλλον πρὸς τοὺς πωλοῦντας and these words could be an addition to an otherwise epic narrative. The conversation concludes the second section of the parable. The shorter form of v9 provides a closer parallel to the first leg of the conversation in v8.

Analysis: Section C. The Conclusion
v.10 ἀπερχομένων δὲ αὐτῶν ἀγοράσαι. The Infinitive Adjunct to a Genitive Absolute is rare. All the uses are parabolic in the Synoptic Gospels: Mt 18:24,25 with its close parallel in Lk 7:42, and Mt 25:10. The three Matthean passages have exactly the same structure; the Lucan lacks the Particle. The Adjunct is added to the stock Genitive Absolute formula.

ἀπέρχομαι is not otherwise used with a Genitive Absolute in the Synoptic Gospels, although other compounds of ἔρχομαι and πορεύομαι are. Nor does the Verb appear elsewhere in Matthew in the Present tense except at Mt 8:19/Lk 9:57. It has an extraordinary pattern of synoptic relationships which includes the following: Mt 11x Diff Mk; Mk 9x Diff Mt; Lk 2x Diff Mt.[170] ἔρχομαι and its compounds occur in some Matthean parables with an Infinitive of Purpose. It would seem extremely likely that this 12-syllable introduction to the final section, balancing the Genitive Absolute at the commencement of the middle section, is pre-Matthean, epic and parabolic.

---

168 Blass, Debrunner, Funk, *Grammar* §370(4).
169 Blass, Debrunner, Funk, *Grammar* §428(6).
170 On ἀπέρχομαι, see p.295 n.48.

αἱ ἕτοιμοι appears to be an echo of Mt 24:44/Lk 12:40. It can be used as a dual termination Adjective, as Judith 9:6 LXX indicates, so Schenk's elaborate morphological theory is unnecessary.[171]

εἰσῆλθον εἰς has an impressive record as a homogenizing formula in the Synoptic Gospels, and Matthew represents this process particularly well.

γάμοι. This is the first occasion in the parable when the word 'wedding' has appeared. It is in the Plural form, as in Mt 22:2-4,9 (although the Singular appears in 22:8) and Lk 14:8. It belongs to a long phrase and could possibly have been a Matthean addition. Without it the rhythmic pattern in v10 would be 12:7:11:7. Without it the assonance and alliteration of v10b and 10c would be more striking. It is of course possible that μετ' αὐτοῦ is an intrusive phrase. It does however belong to the associations of 'sleeping', 'rising' and 'being with the Lord'.

ἐκλείσθη ἡ θύρα is the beginning of the overlap with the Q passage. In the Matthean context the proximity of Mt 24:38/Lk 17:27 might recall the Palestinian and Jonathan Targumim, in which the closing of the door of the ark is dramatized. But the crisp, dramatic phrase has resonances of many kinds, personal and existential, literary and theological, and the reference to the Noah episode is only one possibility among many.[172]

Conclusion on v10: Apart from the Matthean gloss εἰς τοὺς γάμους, this verse is in the crisp, epic style in two balanced half-sentences, corresponding in length, with the short halves matching in rhyme, rhythm and grammar.

v11 ὕστερον. This is a very difficult word to evaluate from a redaction-critical point of view. It appears in Mt 21 3x in parables; in 21:29 and 32 it is of structural importance. It occurs also in Mt 4:2 and 22:27, in both cases with Lucan parallels against Mark; in Lk 4:2, the Lucan parallel to Mt 4:2, where Matthew has ὕστερον, Luke has a rare final Genitive Absolute, paralleled in Matthew only in 28:13. The only other use in the Synoptics is alongside a Dative Absolute in the Marcan longer ending: Mk 16:14. It would be possible to designate it redactional. It has however a relationship to pre-Matthean traditions, such that, if it is called redactional, redaction and tradition would need to be understood in a very close relationship.

---

171 Schenk, *Gliederungssignal*, 464-475.
172 Goulder, *Midrash*, 438.

ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν at the beginning of v12 belongs to a similar category. It is found in parables elsewhere: e.g. Mt 21:29, Lk 15:29; it is a traditional Matthean formula.[173]

ἔρχονται. The change to the Historic Present has been assessed by Schenk, as a Matthean stylistic technique for marking key narrative moments. Although in other respects Matthew's use of the Historic Present may not be distinctive (MS variations are again a major difficulty) there is a good case for understanding the Historic Present as marking important events in a narrative.[174]

αἱ λοιπαὶ παρθένοι. The two uses of the Adjective in 22:6 and 27:49 illustrate again the problem of knowing where tradition ends and redaction begins. Certainly the early position of the Adjective could well be Matthean, but this could be evidence for a Matthean addition of παρθένοι to an original αἱ λοιπαὶ (see MS 700).

κύριε. From this point, the phrase from Q (see Lk 13:35) completes the verse. The Q material is particularly interesting here since Mt 25:12 and Lk 13:25 are parallel, so are Lk 13:26-27 and Mt 7:22-23, and so are Lk 12:35-46 and Mt 24:43-51. The rhythm of these two verses differs from the earlier section of the parable. The syllable count is 17:11:8:11. Apart from the first half, there are again two sets of balancing sentence halves, as in v10, offering a chiastic positioning of the two groups. It is therefore possible either to regard vv11-12 as editorial and the Matthean editor as drawing Q material into an original epic parable, or preferably, in view of the continuity of the narrative and the difficulty of ending at v10, the older ending could be reconstructed (using ἦλθον from Codex D, again a Western reading, as possibly an earlier form of the parable):

ὕστερον (τότε) ἦλθον καὶ αἱ λοιπαὶ λέγουσαι
κύριε, κύριε, ἄνοιξον ἡμῖν. ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν
ἀμην λέγω ὑμῖν· οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς.

The parable represents an epic parable written in a single style, but with slight editorial touches in vv9-11. That earlier parable may itself have been the product of a linking of the Q tradition with an otherwise unknown parable, and was in turn influenced by the association with the parables of *The Thief* and *The Servants* at the pre-Matthean stage.

These findings provide a substantial critique of Puig i Tàrrech's reconstruction of the parable's history. According to Puig i Tàrrech the

---

[173] See p.335 n.214.

[174] Schenk, *Gliederungssignal*, 464-475; Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 239 n.95.

adverbial signals in vv5,6,10 and 11 divide the narrative into five parts, and the Tenses and Particles give an outline to the movement of the narration. The centre of the narration is the bridegroom, his expected arrival, his imminence and his arrival, with a corresponding series of actions on the part of the two groups of companions. The eventual separation of the foolish from the wise is a consequence of one vital initial difference: one group did not think to take oil with them. Scenes 2 and 5 are therefore not integral to the plot; they cloud the issue by treating the ten together, by introducing the motif of sleep and by associating the folly of five of them with failure to reckon on the bridegroom's delay. Our findings show that the tense usage is not definable in terms of a single sequence: ἐξῆλθον εἰς ὑπάντησιν is picked up by the parallel Verbs ἐξερχεσθε εἰς ἀπάντησιν and εἰσῆλθον μετ' αὐτοῦ. Our findings also show that the problems of the narrative are not restricted to scenes 2 and 5: Why are ἀγγείοις introduced? Why do reflexive forms only appear in scenes 1 and 3? Why does πᾶσαι appear also in scene 3? Why does scene 3 begin with μέσης δὲ νυκτὸς? Why is one group called αἱ ἑτοιμοί in scene 4? It appears that the source of the problem is not, as Puig i Tàrrech suggests, the slowing up of the narrative by the introduction of episodes. In any case how can we know that the speed of the narrative has slowed? Given that uncertainty, why must we assume that there must be a shift in the narrative from the level of the narration to the level of the metaphor and that the shift should be identified with the refusal of the wise to lend the foolish oil?

Behind Mt 25:1-12 was an epic parable. The pre-Matthean epic parable was suitable for a Sitz im Leben in which the death of members of the Christian community before the Parousia caused pastoral problems. To this extent Schenk is correct. It is an affirmation of the Kingdom beyond death. In the epic form, it was however an affirmation which recognized the hypocrisy involved in hoping for the the Kingdom but refusing to live by its demands. That degree of uncommitedness, διψυχία,[175] is (according to this tradition) fatal. The placing of the λαμπάδες references and the contrast between the two groups in terms of ἔλαιον gave the epic form an unmistakably moral emphasis. It is not particularly fruitful to enquire how the parable in this form stands in relation to the Pauline tradition. It is not, for example, clear whether the parable could have been heard without difficulty against the background of 1 Cor. 3:10-15. There too it is fatal not to have produced works, but not ultimately fatal. The possibility of ultimate punishment may be present in Mt 24:51, and it is difficult to say more than that.

---

[175] Seitz, *Antecedents*, 211ff.

There is one other important feature of the epic parable, the conversation between the two groups. It hints at the help which the righteous might give to the sinners, although in the case of the parable the help was refused. If help at the Last Judgment is in question, the help requested could presumably have been of two different kinds, of intercession or of vicarious merit.[176] These subjects were discussed in the later decades of the first century CE, and careless discussion of them could have provided an excuse for lax behaviour.[177] The epic parable may have touched on this. The Matthean editorial work, and the γρηγορεῖτε motif in the wider context, would have given the parable a keen edge to attack such laxness. The specific reference in the parable to those who have good works for sale could indicate that in the end there is no satisfactory assistance for the sinner seeking entry to the Final Feast. Those who try to draw on that resource for final salvation will be excluded and disowned.

(iii) *The Tradition*

The parable of *The Young Women,* when examined against the tradition of narrative parables as a whole, has a particularly interesting feature. The narrative parable, like the ancient drama, had customarily three principal participants. The members of the group are treated like the ancient Chorus; they act in concert. The parable follows that ancient custom. There are the three participants: the foolish, the wise and the bridegroom. If the relationship of these is to be examined, then, following Funk, the Bridegroom may be called the Determiner, the one with respect to whom the narrative moves, and the two groups may be called Respondents 1 and 2. Normally the relationships between these three follow a limited pattern. Funk calls this pattern 'the law of the open triangle',[178] that only two of the three relationships possible between the three participants will be developed. In this parable the relationships which are developed are those between the Respondents, and between Respondent 1 and the Determiner. The relationship between the Determiner and Respondent 2 is not given narrative value. Funk sets this surface pattern of relationships against what is often called its deep structure, the fundamental relationships involved. On the level of fundamental relationships, the fate of the wise and the foolish is settled in relation to the Bridegroom. So, in this parable, and this parable alone among the narrative parables, the surface relationships do not match the pattern of the fundamental relationships. As far as the surface pattern is concerned, the 'open triangle' leaves the relationship of the Determiner and Respondent 2 unexplored. At its deeper level the relationship is definitive.

---

176 Derrett, *Studies*, I 141.

177 4 Ezra 7:102-115.

178 Funk, *Structure*, 51f, 56.

Seen against the background of the narrative parables as a whole, the two sets of conversations in Mt 25:1-12 are distinctive and they suggest that the special contribution made by the parable is to be found in them. At the level of interpretation the parable concerns not simply the relative fates of the two groups, but the relationships between the two groups. This provides a different perspective on the parable from that which the verse-by-verse analysis developed. The verse-by-verse analysis located the area of interest in the intercession of the righteous for sinners or in the sharing of merit. But it was not able to focus attention on the relation of this to the fate of the sinners alone. The interpretation of the parable therefore has to follow the pattern already used in parables which develop the corpus mixtum idea. The relationship between the good and the evil has to be understood in the light of the ultimate judgment of evil and the standards endorsed by the Son of Man.

Is it possible to trace the history of the parable further back? Is it possible to go back behind the Q epic parable? Our analysis suggests that the conclusion of the parable with its parallel in Luke warned that those who anticipated entry into the Kingdom might be refused. It was one of several such warnings in the form of logia and historical parables. Israel or Jerusalem or its leaders were not safe; they could be rejected and replaced if they were not ready for the coming of the Bridegroom. At some stage the narrative shifted from its role as a general warning to a role promising a future separation of good and bad, and from there to an affirmation of the victory of the Kingdom over death.

Biblical material and midrashim provided a variety of pictures by which these shifts from warning to affirmation of victory could have been effected. The bridegroom imagery was probably one of these, perhaps based on Song of Songs 3:11, as in Mishnah Taan 4:8 and Sifre Lev 9:21, with the daughters of Jerusalem going out to meet the king on his wedding day, or on Isaiah 61:10, as in Pesiqta Rabbati Piska 37:2. Songs of Songs 5:2 could also have been the basis for the sayings concerning the bridegroom knocking on the door. But the issue concerning that stage is whether the parable was already an epic parable.[179]

Another set of Jewish traditions relevant to the parable's development is that concerning vicarious merit. It seems almost certain that the Tannaitic discussion of 'merit' would have agreed with the parable, that at the Last Judgment the merits of the Fathers could not counterbalance personal demerits, but that, on the other hand, the necessity of good works does not carry with it the presumption that good deeds earn salvation. The need for this to be said indicates the danger of misunderstandings which might have

[179] Flusser, *Gleichnisse*.

been built on the basis of statements such as Sukkah 45b. The position of Matthew in relation to the 'pious posterity', by virtue of which Israel could look for divine mercy, could have raised similar problems. Matthew's tradition appreciated the long tradition of prophets, wise men and martyrs, without whose offering the witness to the Kingdom would be incomplete. Against that background the parable is a warning not merely concerning aspects of Jewish end-expectation but a warning with regard to Matthew's tradition also. The interdependence of the faithful on the Last Day is a relevant factor in the discussion. It was a feature of both Jewish and Christian thought, not least in the 'martyr tradition' (see Heb 11:40), and could easily give the false impression that the weak would be carried along by the strong, and the sinners by the righteous, whereas in each case the stress on interdependence was intended as a motive to show perseverance to the end. The prayer of the strong for the weak (4 Ezra 7:112) was part of this interdependence in the present, but the limits of that intercession at the last day had to be clearly recognized (4 Ezra 7:115).

(iv–v) *The History of the Parables and the History of Redaction*

The dating of the epic form of this parable in the period of the development of Q material provides important evidence for the dating of the epic parable's currency. That an epic form could, despite the simplicity of its narrative, carry deep resonances of many kinds, is a further important finding, particularly in view of Funk's judgment that epic language is language shorn of its history. He is incorrect on that point. Moreover Matthew shows evidence of the extended epic in which the resonances were increased and the opportunities for reflection extended.

The redactional history of the parable, in its connection with *The Thief* and *The Servants*, and in its incorporation in the Marcan outline, shows the Gospel writer working within a tradition which wrestled with the same issues over a considerable period of time. The constant pressures to dismiss the value of Christian work and service, in the light of the promise of the Kingdom, seem to have persisted over a long period. This gave the parable a continued importance. In Matthew's day the form of the parable and its context addressed the need for a significantly extended period of Christian work and service. In earlier days the parable met the problems caused by the death of Christians before the Parousia. In the later period, when Matthew was writing, the problem may have been similar; but the pressures seem to have increased and with them the need for a parable which would encourage an even greater determination in the present. For this, the epic parable of *The Young Women* proved admirably adaptable.

E. *The Parables of the Talents*: Mt 25:14-30/Lk 19:12-27.

(i) *The Context*

Between the group of three parables just described and the Final Judgment scene built by Matthew from the conclusion of the eschatological Q material, is the parable of *The Talents*. It has a parallel in Lk 19:12-27 which provides a bridge from the Journey material to the Jerusalem entry material (Lk 19:11). The two versions have a skeletal agreement, all the more significant because both versions have a long and complicated structure.[180] That agreement becomes exact, word-for-word agreement at the conclusion of the parable (Mt 25:27b-29/Lk 19:23b-26); but in the opening sections, especially the opening verses, there are only sporadic hints of agreement. In the first of the four sections of the Matthean parable there are two suggestions of dependence on Mk 13:34: ὥσπερ γὰρ ἄνθρωπος and κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν δύναμιν. The development of the first section of the Matthean parable could therefore be due to the influence of the Marcan context. The Marcan context provided the outline as far as Mt 24:36; Mt 24:42 and 25:13 agree with Mk 13:35; Mt 25:14 corresponds to Mk 13:34.

This does not however mean that the opening section of the Matthean parable was developed by Matthew at the point when the Gospel writer linked the Q parable with the Marcan outline. Since this is an important issue, supporting evidence is required.

Mt 25:14 ὥσπερ γὰρ: Grundmann[181] regards the origins of this phrase as to be found in Mk 13:34, because, as in Mark, given that the phrase indicates a comparison, there is no indication what the comparison is to be made with; the introduction is an anacoluthon. However, the shift from the Marcan ὡς to the Matthean ὥσπερ γὰρ needs further explanation; for ὡς and ὥσπερ are not necessarily interchangeable.[182] Mt 24:37 might provide that

---

[180] For the possible lines of development in the tradition of this parable, see Weiser, *Knechtsgleichnisse*, 228f; Resenhöfft, *Talenten*, 318-331, who suggests that the Matthean and Lucan traditions each contribute a half, although the language of the parable is against this; on Luke's parable as a mixture of two kinds of parables, see Kuhn, *Giljonim*, 58ff.

[181] Grundmann, *Evangelium*, 521f, regards this introduction in 25:14 as an anacoluthon (see Jülicher, *Gleichnisreden*, II 472), giving no precise indication what the parable is to be compared with. He concludes from this that it is intended to answer the questions left open by the previous parable. The origins of the opening phrase may, he suggests, be found in Mk 13:34.

[182] Although the uses of ὡς and ὥσπερ in the New Testament cannot be regarded as interchangeable, the comparison of Mt 25:14 and Mk 13:34 is fair, since these are the only New Testament examples of comparisons in the form of an incomplete sentence, where the sentence cannot be completed simply by repeating a previously given Verb. The nearest parallel is Mt 20:28 Diff Mk, but there the connection with the previous sentence is so clear as to render the ὥσπερ

explanation, except that 24:37a has an answering οὕτως in 24:37b, and Mt 24:37 is too far from 25:14 for the οὕτως clause to be assumed for 25:14. γάρ does not make immediate or obvious sense.[183] It could, whatever the origin of ὥσπερ, be a reminiscence of Mt 24:37. It could require a further extension of the meaning of γρηγορεῖτε (Mt 25:13), to include within it 'accountable stewardship'. The whole opening phrase seems to move beyond the Marcan original, without smoothing over the latter's grammatical difficulties.

ἄνθρωπος ἀποδημῶν continues the parallel with Mark, but in this case there is also a similarity with Mark in that the Marcan text is picked up by means of a Participle which refers to the future (contrast the Aorist

---

clause a comparative clause concluding the main sentence. The use of ὥσπερ with γεγράπται in 1 Cor 10:7 is open to question textually (see Moulton, *Grammar*, III 320). Because Mt 25:14 and Mk 13:34 represent so unusual a construction, the influence of Mark in the Matthean opening is possible. It remains true however that ὡς and ὥσπερ are not interchangeable: ὥσπερ can mean 'it is just like' (Plutarch, *Moralia*, 7C; Ignatius, *Magnesians*, 5:2, although in 5:2 the sentence is properly concluded). Perhaps the editor of Matthew knew of such a use. The hypothesis of some kind of link between Mk 13:34 and Mt 25:14 is strengthened by the similarity of content between Mk 13:33 and Mt 25:13. Mk 13:33 and 13:35 are also reflected in Mt 24:42, which makes the distance between Mt 24:42 and 25:13 intriguing. Mt 24:45-51 may be seen as a replacement for Mk 13:34-35 (Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 71); in that case the delay in the use of the parable to this point requires explanation, especially in view of the close parallel between Mt 25:14 and Mk 13:34.

[183] Despite the commentators who regard γάρ as introducing the new parable so as to make it an exposition of the need for watchfulness (Weder, *Gleichnisse*, 194), one has to enquire what this parable could have to do with watchfulness as watchfulness has been so defined so far. It is about expected accountability, not watchfulness in its usual sense. The Marcan parable in Mk 13:33-34 is about watchfulness because of its final five words; but Mt 25:14ff is not, unless we extend its meaning. The γάρ as it stands at present in Mt 25:14 does not have an immediate link with the preceding verse 25:13 (as Weder maintains) and must have only a general reference to the subject raised by the previous parables in 24:42-44, 24:45-51 and 25:1ff. The ὥσπερ γάρ in 25:14 offers an echo of Mt 24:37, where the sentence is completed by the apodosis: οὕτως ἔσται ἡ παρουσία τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. It is of course possible that Matthew assumed the same conclusion in 25:14, supporting the view that the force of the γάρ is general to the subject but not specific to the preceding verse. How ὥσπερ γάρ came to be in the text is a matter for conjecture. One possibility is that ὥσπερ (ἀποδημ-) is due to the building of a parable collection using some Q and some Marcan material. This need not have included 24:37-40 (Lk 17:26-27,34-35) and the γάρ might be the result of the proximity of 24:37 to 25:14 in the final editing stage. Alternatively it could have been part of the Marcan material encouraged by the final five words of the original Marcan parable in Mk 13:33-34. In either case Schulz's judgment, based on Bultmann, that ὥσπερ γάρ is to be ascribed to Matthew, is somewhat premature (Schulz, *Q*, 288).

ἀπεδήμησεν which follows in 25:15d). Such a Participle lacks any precise equivalent.[184] Its closest analogy is in Lk 14:31, where a parable begins with a Present Participle indicating future action.

τοὺς ἰδίους δούλους cannot be described as a Matthean phrase and represents a development in the use of ἴδιος.[185]

παρέδωκεν is repeated Diff Lk in vv14,20 and 22, whereas Mark has the Simple Verb (see Mk 12:9 Diff Mt).[186]

τὰ ὑπάρχοντα recalls Mt 24:47 (Par Lk 12:44),[187] but has the Genitive Pronoun (the probable reading), which is non-Matthean and parabolic.

---

[184] The use of a Present tense for a future intention is found in the Synoptics as follows:

Mt 20:20 Diff Mk may be understood in this way, but more probably it represents only a variation of the frequently found expressions using προσέρχομαι; see 17:14 Diff Mk 9:16; 24:1 Diff Mk; and Mk 10:2 Diff Mt. One could not, on the basis of this evidence, argue that the Present Participle indicating a future intention was Matthean.

Mt 22:16 Diff Mk could well mean 'sent...who said' or 'sent.... They said' rather than 'sent to say'. The usage is unclear. Matthew's use is represented by 22:3 Par Lk; 13:41 No Par; 21:2 Diff Mk; 21:34 Diff Mk.

Mt 26:25 No Par: this is probably a future use but is highly traditional: see 10:4 Diff Mk; 26:46 Par Mk; 26:48 Par Mk; 27:3 No Par; Lk 22:21 No Par.

Lk 1:35 No Par is a secure future reference.

Lk 2:34 No Par probably means 'which people customarily reject'.

Lk 13:23 Diff Mt possibly means 'those about to be saved' but the Matthean parallel is very likely to be present in the sense of 'those entering'.

Lk 14:31 No Par is very like Mt 25:14 in position and sense.

Lk 22:19-20 (Diff Mk, Par Mk) probably have a future reference.

See Acts 21:2 (and more dubiously 26:17).

There is no strong evidence for regarding the Participle in Mt 25:14 as Matthean and there is good evidence from Lk 14:31 that a Present Participle with a Future reference can be part of parabolic style. Mt 25:14 is clumsier than Lk 14:31 because the same Verb is repeated in its Indicative form at the end of 25:15. This suggests that the Participle in 25:14 represents the Marcan ἄνθρωπος ἀπόδημος rather than being an expression coined freely for the occasion.

[185] ἴδιος Schenk, 296; Gundry, 644; Neirynck, 262; Bergemann, 121.

Apart from κατ' ἰδίαν·

Mt 1x No Par; 1x Diff Mk; 3x Diff Lk; 1x Text?

Lk 1x No Par; 1x Diff Mk; 1x Diff Mt; 1x *Mt.

[186] See Brown, *Death*, 211-213, on παραδίδωμι.

[187] This is one of several links between this parable and 24:47 Par Lk (Lk 12:44). In addition to Mt 24:47 and 25:14, τὰ ὑπάρχοντα is found in Mt Diff Mk 1x (Mt 19:21 Diff Mk 10:21 ὅσα ἔχεις); Lk 8x: 5x No Par; 1x Par Mt; 1x Diff Mt; 1x Diff Mk/Diff Mt. See *Zenon Papyri* 2191.2 (116BCE). There is an interesting shift of usage in relation to the accompanying case: Mt 24:47 has the Dative of the Personal Pronoun in some MSS, and this is found in Luke twice. Luke elsewhere uses the Genitive (including parabolic contexts). If the Genitive is read in Mt 24:47, as it should be also in 25:14, the parabolic character of the

ᾧ μὲν ἔδωκεν Mt 25:15 represents the traditional enumerative use of the Particles μὲν and δὲ,[188] expanding the idea implicit in the Marcan form: ἑκάστῳ τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ (Mk 13:34).

ἑκάστῳ κατά develops the Marcan form, using terminology and phraseology from Deut 16:10 and 16:17. There is a similarity with Mt 16:27, but the context and force of 25:15 concerns a response to divine providence, and not only, as in 16:27, recompense according to deeds.[189] The Lucan parallels for Mt 25:14 and 15 in Lk 19:12-14 concern a claimant to the throne who travels a distance with the intention of returning as king, but meanwhile his fellow countrymen send an embassy to have him removed. This corresponds to the Lucan context in 19:11, but has no parallel in Matthew's parable of *The Talents*.[190] A careful study of the language of this Lucan section is decisively against an editorial origin (pace Schulz).[191] The Lucan parallel also involves the 'iska' procedure[192] and a

---

expression is further underlined. On the alternatives to ὑπάρχοντα, see Pöhlmann, *Abschichtung*, 206ff.

[188] Jones, *Matthew 18*, 436ff.

[189] ἑκάστῳ is only found in Mt Diff Mk as part of a technical phase. Except for this example here in 25:14, the uses are Mt 2x No Par; Lk 4x No Par; 1x *Mt. The parabolic character of the word appeared in 25:14 and Lk 16:5. The closest parallel to Mt 25:14 is Mt 16:27, where the OT quotation reads: ἀποδώσει ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὴν πρᾶξιν αὐτοῦ. An interesting feature of this phrase is κατὰ + Accusative, found in Matthew 5x No Par in the sense of 'according to', and once in a decisively editorial position (Mt 19:3 Diff Mk). Against this has to be set the evidence of Mk 7:5 Diff Mt (παραβαίνω). Luke uses κατὰ + Accusative in the sense of 'according to' 12x, none of which are Diff Mt and many of which are in the Infancy Narrative. Lk has κατὰ + Accusative in 17:30 Diff Mt (Mt 24:39 has οὕτως). ἕκαστος κατὰ is an LXX construction: Gen 41:11; 49:28; Ex 28:21; 36:4; Num 1:4; 4:19; 7:5; with δύναμιν Deut 16:17.

[190] See ch.4 p.251 n.253. The additions to Luke have a historical flavour: Zerwick, *Thronwärter*, 654ff; Winterbotham, *Archelaus*, 338ff; Weinert, *Throne Claimant*, 505ff; Lambrecht, *Treasure*, 222ff. It is generally accepted that the Lucan form reflects contemporary history; some suggest that the reference is to Archelaus.

[191] Schulz argues that ἐπορεύθη εἰς χώραν μακρὰν is a redactional addition. This is doubtful (see Weiser, *Knechtsgleichnisse*, 230f). On πορεύομαι, see p.256 n.269. Both Matthew and Luke use πορεύομαι in place of the Marcan ἀπέρχομαι and ὑπάγω and both prefer the Simple to the Compound Verb (on details of translation, see Senior, *Passion*, 42f). There is therefore a likelihood that Matthew and Luke represent a shift of usage (see Mt 11:7 Diff Lk and Lk 14:31). εἰς χώραν μακρὰν uses the favourite Lucan Preposition after πορεύομαι (10x No Par; 3x Diff Mk); but the phase is a traditional one (see Carlston, *Redaction*, 370f; Pöhlmann, 194ff).

[192] See Derrett, *Law*, 22, where Derrett is right to assume iska procedure behind the Verb πραγματεύσασθε, but wrong to assume that it necessarily has an object: see Philo, *In Flaccum*, 57; Moulton-Milligan, 819.

probable Parousia reference,[193] both of which correspond to the Matthean parable in intention, but not in detail. The financial actualities of the procedure are not reflected in the Matthean language.[194]

The Lucan parallel refers to ten servants, yet only specifies three in the narrative. Marshall regards the three as original, but the Lucan and synoptic uses of ἕτερος (Lk 19:20) do not bear out this judgment.[195] Other stylistic features of the Lucan parallel, e.g. καλέσας δέ,[196] point neither to Lucan editorial work, nor to Matthean editorial omissions.[197]

The development in Mt 25:13-14 cannot be dissociated from the Marcan phrase in Mk 13:34. The form which the development takes is not necessarily to be attributed entirely to the Matthean editor. The evidence would be compatible either with an association of Q and Marcan material, or with editorial work at the point of the Gospel's creation. But the former, particularly in view of the second section of the parable, seems on balance the more likely.

The second section of the Matthean parable (Mt 25:16-18) is an expansion of Mt 25:15, and lacks any parallel in Luke. Mt 25:16-18 anticipates the constantly repeated πέντε τάλαντα, and records that the one who received

---

[193] The temporal use of ἐν ᾧ may reflect parallel expressions which refer to the Parousia (see Jn 21:22; 1 Tim 4:13); alternatively it could be a classicism with incidental Parousia associations.

[194] Matthew's choice of vocabulary here is general not specific.

[195] There is no New Testament text where ἕτερος means 'third'. There are several where it means 'second' and several where it indicates sequential ordering. In several of these, the sequential order of items is not intended to be the sum total of the designated whole (see Lk 14:19f).

[196] καλέσας is unusual as an opening Participle in the Gospels. An opening Adverbial Participle with δέ it is found in parables:

Mt 7x No Par (18:27,28; 13:27,46; 20:2,9; 25:24);
1x Diff Lk (22:11)
Lk 1x Diff Mt (19:13); 1x Diff Mk (20:14; see Mt 21:38 Diff Mk)
1) Adverbial Participles accompanied by καί:
Mt 9x: 3x No Par; 2x Par Mk; 3x Diff Mk; 1x Diff Lk
Mk 2x: 2x Par Mt
Lk 8x: 4x No Par; 4x Diff Mt
2) Adverbial Participles accompanied by δὲ:
Mt 5x No Par (18:24,25; 20:8; 25:5,10). Lk 1x No Par (15:14).
3) Adverbial Participles accompanied by οὖν: Mt 18:26,29 No Par.
4) Adverbial Participles accompanied by τότε: Lk 14:21 Diff Mt.
5) Adverbial Participle without a Particle: Mt 21:28; 25:16 (some MSS δε),22. Lk 15:18 No Par.

On this basis it would be unwise to suggest that καλέσας δέ represents Lucan editorial work or that its absence in Matthew was Matthean editorial work.

[197] This style of sentence is by no means foreign to the New Testament parable. For the case that Matthew's parable is more original than Luke's, see Lambrecht, *Treasure*, 223.

them gained a further five. ἄλλα πέντε is characteristic of Matthean parabolic language,[198] but the insistent rhythmic effect of πέντε τάλαντα is not matched by similar interests in the opening verse of the parable. The second section anticipates other words too from the body of the parable, e.g. 25:17 (and v16 also, if εκερδησεν is the correct reading there, although that may be doubted),[199] see ἐκέρδησα Mt 25:20 Diff Lk 19:16 προσηγάσατο (see Mt 25:22/Lk 19:18). Interestingly Matthew has in 25:16 the colourless Simple Verb ἠργάσατο[200] with an unusual instrumental ἐν following it.[201]

---

198 The order of these words is the natural and almost exclusively used order in the New Testament (Mk 12:5 is the exception).

ἄλλος Schenk, 21f; Gundry, 641; Neirynck, 211, 338; Bergemann.

Mt 30x: 4x No Par; 10x Par Mk; 1x Par Lk; 6x Diff Lk; 8x Diff Mk; 1x Text?

Mk 23x: 10x Par Mt; 2x >*Mt; 10x > ; 1x Text?

Lk 11x: 2x No Par; 5x Par Mk; 1x Diff Mk; 1x Par Mt; 1x Diff Mt; 1x > Mt?. Five of the Mt Diff Lk occur in the sense of 'further' or 'additional'; 2 of the 8x Mt Diff Mk have the same sense but are part of a usage found in the editing of parable collections (see 13:24,31,33; 21:33) or in the development of the Marcan text (e.g. Mt 4:21). The parabolic use of the word is strong in Matthew (20:3,6; see 12:4,5,9); this may have influenced Mt 4:21. Mk 14:58 (>*Mt) is probably due to a basic change of attitude in the Matthean text rather than simply to a choice of vocabulary. Lk 1x Diff Mt uses ἄλλος against Matthew's ἕτερος.

ἕτερος Schenk, 22; Gundry, 644; Neirynck, 338, 372; Bergemann; Metzger, 55.

Mt 10x: 2x No Par; 4x Par Lk; 3x Diff Lk; 1x Text?

Lk 34x: 18x No Par; 6x Diff Mk; 4x Par Mt; 3x Diff Mt; 1x No Par or Diff Mt; 2x Text

199 The weight of MS evidence in terms of the families of texts and the degree of repetition within the parable make εκερδησεν a strong contender in 25:16. But it is hard to see why the evidence for εποιησεν is so extensive. εποιησεν in 25:16 can hardly be due to Luke19:18, since 25:16 alone of all the parallels to Lk 19:18 carries evidence for εποιησεν. The use of untechnical language is typical of Matthean epic parables, as the following note illustrates, and it is possible that εποιησεν should be read in 25:16.

200 The Matthean financial terms are, in general, lacking in colour in comparison with Luke's.

ἠργάσατο

Mt 4x: 1x Par Mk (with εἰς, see Senior, *Passion*, 36: 'done something to'; 2x No Par (21:28 *The Two Sons*; 25:16 *The Talents*); 1x Diff Lk Luke has ἐργάται. See Wrege, *Überlieferung*, 149 n.3.

The use of this Verb with reference to finance is rare: it is found in an absolute sense in Demosthenes, Polybius and Ag. Dionysodorus. It is used with money as an object e.g. in Aristophanes, *Equites*, 840 (where the Scholia has συνάξεις).

201 The instrumental use of ἐν is much discussed (see Schenk, *Sprache*, 241). For the purposes of this comparison the Blass–Debrunner–Funk definition suffices; there is very little variation across the Gospels within the uses parallel to 25:16.

Mt 12x: 5x Par Mk (5:13; 12:24 Par Lk; 21:23 (Lk 20:2),24,27 (Lk 20:8);

The section also shares vocabulary with other Matthean parables, e.g. ὡσαύτως 25:17.[202] 25:18 uses a traditional phrase for the burying[203] of the single talent, and refers to the money by the word ἀργύριον, the word found also in Lk 19:23. In the parallel to Lk 19:23, Matthew has the Plural, and the difference in the grammatical number of the Noun between Mt 25:18 (Singular) and 25:27 (Plural) is interesting for several reasons. From a text-critical point of view 25:18 is a firm reading, whereas the Plural in 25:27 is read only by ℵ*BWΘ 700 Sy^{hl}. The pattern of other textual readings in Matthean uses of ἀργύρια[204] suggests that the problem has been caused by the Zechariah quotation in the Passion Narrative (26:15). After 26:15 the MS readings of ἀργύρια settle down. If the Plural is read in 25:27, then the Judas episode must be seen to have had a retroactive effect on this parable. In that case the Singular ἀργύριον in 25:18, if it is read, is a significant piece of tradition, with a Lucan parallel at a point where the Matthean text is influenced by the Passion Narrative to follow. So there are sufficient non-Matthean and pre-Matthean features in Section Two of the Matthean parable to warrant the judgment that this section, an extension of Section One, is not satisfactorily explained as Matthean editorial work.

2x No Par (9:34; 26:52); 2x Par Lk 12:27, 12:28);
3x Diff Lk (7:1; 7:1; 25:16)

Mk 9x: 5x Par Mt (3:22; 9:50; 11:28 Par Lk; 11:29; 11:33 Par Lk);
1x >*Mt (14:1 is perhaps a modal use); 2x > ; 1x Text?

Lk 11x: 3x No Par (1:51; 11:18, see 11:19 Par Mt; 14:31);
2x Par Mt (11:20; 11:19);
4x Par Mk (11:15 Par Mt; 14:34 Par Mt; 20:2,8);
1x Diff Mk or No Par (22:49); 1x Text?

202 p.380 n.144.

203 Derrett, *Law*, 24, and Jeremias, *Parables*, 61 n.51, agree that the burial of money provided the best security against theft in Palestine, and the greatest freedom from liability. The practice was however more widespread: *Cor Fab Aesop* 42. Whether burial of money constituted everywhere the death of the 'isca' arrangement is a different matter. That is compatible with the Matthean narrative (25:18: it was his master's money) but not essential to it.

204 26:15 Some MSS read στατηρας but none of the MSS are those which support the Plural in 25:27. If αργυρια is read in 26:15, it could be an adaptation of the Marcan Singular to indicate 'coins' (see Senior, *Passion*, 47 and n.6), or a tradition akin to that of the LXX (ἀργυροῦς); it is unlikely to be a simple editorial preference (pace Knowles, *Jeremiah*, 55).

27:3 Some MSS indicate the Plural (see Senior, *Passion*, 354ff, 377). In 27:5,6 argentum is read by the Georgian version (and in 27:5 by d); in 7:9 there are no variations.

28:12 The Plural is read here: αργυρια ικανα εδωκαν τοις στρατιωταις.

28:13 pecunias copias ff^2; αργυριον ικ. D pecuniam copiosam (multam) vg multum auri Aeth Coptic^{sa}.

28:15 αργυρια BW 1574; τα αργυρια The remaining uncials and minuscles.

On balance it is likely that the Q parable was associated with the Marcan motif of ἑκάστῳ τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ at a stage at which development was possible within the pre-Matthean period. The context of the parable at that stage canot be identified from the material of its first two sections, but these will be seen later to be compatible with a later Q stage of which other parables have given evidence. Once incorporated into the Marcan context, it became a parable concerned with 'watching' as 'accountable stewardship' during the time before the End. The particular Matthean presentation of this theme is dealt with next.

(ii) *The Redaction*

There are five points of interest, the large number of interesting issues suggesting that this is an 'extended epic'.

1) The gifts given to each.

The phrase κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν δύναμιν brings together, as is the case in Deuteronomy, divine grace, human labour and blessing for the labourer.[205] As the master in the parable commits to his slaves appropriate gifts, so God (according to Deuteronomy) recommends to his servants the joyful use[206] of his providential gifts. At the time appointed by God for his people to come before him, they are not to appear empty-handed (Deut 16:17 LXX). They have been given abilities and also the gifts on which to use those abilities: κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν δύναμιν is probably to be translated 'to match the gifts of each',[207] meaning that the gifts are appropriate to the skill and resource of each. The decreasing quantity of the gifts in the parable has therefore a particular point, as the decreasing yield in *The Sower* had.[208] The fear, the disappointment and the poor motivation of those less well endowed are registered in the parable as early signals of failure. This parallel with the conclusion of *The Sower* suggests to Schlatter that gifts of 'hearing' and 'understanding' are implied,[209] and while this may be too narrow an interpretation it has the merit that it suits the Matthean warnings about failure, and implies that all should heed them. The parable concerns all; it

---

[205] δύναμις Schenk, 202; Gundry, 643; Neirynck, 235.
The Singular use is unusual in Matthew (3x No Par; 1x Diff Lk) and unusual also is the sense of 'capability', 'ability', 'means' (see 2 Cor 8:3; Sir 29:20), 'skill' (4 Kgs 18:20), or 'resource' (2 Cor 1:8; Ruth 3:11?). Derrett, *Law*, 17-31, suggests that basic to the parable is the concept of trust as this was expressed in Deuteronomy. Curiously Derrett does not specify the point at which Deuteronomy most closely relates to the parable: the requirement to make an offering to God in accordance with the divine generosity.

[206] Holdcraft, *Pounds*, 503f.

[207] Weder, *Gleichnisse*, 196 n.131.

[208] See p.298.

[209] Schlatter, *Matthäus*, 721.

does not concern leaders only, nor only those invested with authority. The danger of failure faces anyone and everyone to whom the divine grace has been shown.[210] Schlatter's interpretation is too narrow for the context offered in Mt 25 as a whole. If, as 25:31ff suggests, the hungry are to be fed, the naked clothed and all the needy rendered service, then it would be difficult for anyone hearing the two parables one after another to limit so decisively the range of the gifts spoken of in 25:14-15. There is a further aspect too to the fear, disappointment and poor motivation of the less endowed. This appears from the Adjective which depicts the relationship between the master and the third servant. He regards his master as σκληρός[211] (24:24 Diff Lk αὐστηρός), treating what was intended as generosity[212] as if it were harsh and mean.[213] In a typically Matthean way the characterization, fairly or unfairly, understands the servant's heart by what he says.[214] He reacts in the wrong way because his attitudes are wrong.

On the other hand, the parable is also concerned with those whose attitudes are regarded as right. At the same point and in a similar gramatical form, in both the Matthean and the Lucan versions, the logion appears which Matthew used after the parable of *The Sower*: Mt 25:29/Lk19:26 (see

---

210 See p.301.

211 Jülicher, *Gleichnisreden*, II 490: 'αὐστηρός ist um mehrere Grade vorsichtiger als σκληρός, es wird z.B. vom Wein, von der Lebensweise gebraucht.' Weiser, *Knechtsgleichnisse*, 246, notes the use of σκληρός in Acts 26:14 and regards αὐστηρός as classical, therefore as corresponding to Lucan style and possibly redactional. Jülicher's view has much to commend it: the Lucan Adjective might more easily have been ambiguous than the Matthean. 2 Macc 14:30 includes αὐστηρότερον and αὐστηρίαν, where the Adjective describes an attitude perceived initially by Maccabaeus as ambiguous but ultimately recognized as threatening. In PTebt 315.19 (second century CE) the root has the same impact. By contrast the classical use is uncomplimentary (Plato, *Rep* 398a). Weiser's judgment is less reliable. In addition to the above evidence, Ps Sol 4:2 deals with the severity of hypocritical judges, which will be judged by God (see in the Gen 42:7 LXX; Isa 9:14; Test Sim 2:4). σκληρός can also express what is experienced as harsh and therefore can properly be used as a predicate where the reference is to how God is experienced (Isa 28:2 LXX; 27:1 Aquila).

212 σκληρός presents the servant's attitude in its distinctiveness from his master's. He experiences decisions as harsh which others regard as generous. For other possible aspects of the word here, see Via, *Parables*, 119; Kamlah, *Geldern*, 34-36.

213 McGaughy, *Fear*, 241-245, identifies the 'hardness' of the master as a reference to a post-exilic maxim (see Job 4:14), by which Yahweh's chosen expressed their sense of abandonment as they continued to guard their ancestral tradition. It is unlikely that this is the only way in which the role of the third servant was to be understood.

214 See Matthew 18:35.

Mt 13:12/Mk 4:25/Lk 8:18). It expresses the positive and the negative sides, placing the negative last: those who have will have more; those who have nothing will lose even what they have. In the context of the parable, as Derrett[215] suggests, the saying expounds the rough justice of the commercial world. As a wandering logion[216] it might have recalled that 'Life is like that—unjust' or, with Plautus,[217] that 'to make money you have to spend it'. In Matthew's parable the sequence of 25:27-28 most probably recalled the double payment so characteristic of this version of the parable. As Deuteronomy suggests: God gives, man receives; man works, man makes; man offers according as God blesses. The parallel may not be exact in logical terms; in terms of a relationship between work and reward it is very apposite.

2) 'Enter into the joy of your lord' (Mt 25:21,23).

The arguments presented for the redactional character of this verse are thin.[218] Two of the arguments concern the use of κύριος and χαρά; they

---

215 Derrett, *Law*, 29ff.

216 Jeremias, *Parables*, 62 n.60.

217 Plautus, *The Comedy of Asses*, 217.

218 ἔφη is claimed by Schulz, *Q*, 290f, and Weiser, *Knechtsgleichnisse*, 242, as redactional, with Luke's εἶπεν as the original Q form. The evidence points to interchanging variants at the literary and the textual transmission levels:

Mt	4:7	Diff Lk	Mt ἔφη αὐτῷ		Lk εἶπεν.
	8:8	Diff Lk	Mt ἀποκριθεὶς, ἔφη		Lk λέγων.
			ℵ*C33 read εἶπεν.		
	13:28	No Par	Mt ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτοῖς.		
	13:29	No Par	Mt ὁ δέ φησιν..		
			D 33 659 1424 1675 read ὁ δὲ λέγει.		
	14:8	Diff Mk	Mt φησιν with direct speech.		Mk > θέλω ἵνα.
			D reads λέγει with a preference for ἔφη in Acts.		
	17:26	No Par	Mt ἔφη αὐτῷ.	1170 reads εἶπεν οὖν.	
	19:18	>*Mk	There are two textual problems here >*Mk:		
			(i) Mt λέγει αὐτῷ ποίας;		
			ℵ L read ποίας φησιν (see 892).		
			(ii) Mt ἔφη B fam[13] (excluding 69) 543 al pauc.		
			εἶπεν Uncs rell Minusc pler.		
	19:21	Diff Mk (Text?)	Mt ἔφη αὐτῷ.	B Θ read εἶπεν .	
	21:27	Diff Mk	Mt ἔφη αὐτοῖς		Mk λέγει
	22:37	Diff Mk	Mt ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτῷ..		Mk Text?
			αποκριθεις, απεκριθη, ειπεν. Lk ειπεν.		
	25:21	Diff Lk	Mt ἔφη αὐτῷ.		Lk εἶπεν.
	25:23	Diff Lk	Mt ἔφη αὐτῷ.		Lk εἶπεν.
	26:34	Diff Mk	Mt ἔφη αὐτῷ.		Mk λέγει.
			Mk λέγει / ἔφη (517)		Lk εἶπεν.
	26:61	Diff Mk	Mt οὗτος ἔφη		Mk λέγοντος.
	27:11	Diff Mk	Mt ὁ δὲ... ἔφη =	Lk 23:3 ἔφη	Mk λέγει.
	27:23	Diff Mk	Mt ὁ δὲ ἔφη.	Mk ἔλεγεν	Lk εἶπεν.

are redactional because they are allegorical. But the label 'redactional' is inappropriate when no other Matthean parable has the master speaking in terms which identify him as the κύριος; and χαρά has a wide range of reference, from 'Enter your master's good life' to 'Enter the joy of heaven'.[219] The origin of the logion is uncertain but, whatever its origin, it must be heard here in Mt 25 alongside the entry of the wise young women

---

	27:65	No Par			
Mk	9:12	Diff Mt	Mk ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτοῖς		Mt ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν.
	9:38	>	Mk ἔφη αὐτῷ		Lk ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν.
	10:20	Diff Mt	Mk ἔφη αὐτῷ.		Mt λέγει.
	10:29	Diff Mt	Mk ἔφη	Lk λέγει	Mt λέγει.
	12:24	Diff Mt	Mk ἔφη αὐτοῖς	Lk εἶπεν	Mt ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν.
	14:29	Diff Mt	Mk ἔφη αὐτῷ	Lk εἶπεν	Mt ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν.

Lk 6x No Par (7:40; 7:44; 15:17; 22:58; 22:70; 23:40).
1x Diff Mk (23:3; see Matthew 27:11 above).

εἶπεν appears as textual variant in Mk 9:12, 10:20, 12:24 and 14:29.

The statistics for εἶπεν confirm the judgment made on ἔφη:

εἶπεν Schenk, 337; Neirynck, 275-281.

Mt 181x: No Par 50x; Par Mk 38; Diff Mk 67x; Par Lk 14x; Diff Lk 10x; Text 2x?

Mk 83x: Par Mt 38x; Diff Mt 18x; >*Mt 1x; >*3x; > Mt 2x; >18x; Text 3x?

Lk 294x: No Par 198x; Par Mk 25x; Diff Mk 46x; Par Mt 14x; Diff Mt 7x; Text 4x?

Among these uses of εἶπεν are 23 Minor Agreements between Matthew and Luke.

The variant in Mt for εἶπεν are Mt Diff Mk 67x: ἐπέτρεψεν, λέγει (19x), διαλογίζομαι, λέγων, ἔλεγον (12x), λέγουσι, (ἐπ)ηρώτων (6x), ἀπεκρίθη, διεστέλλετο, ἔφη (4x), διηγήσωνται, εἶπον, ἔγραψεν, λέγειν (4x), ψευδομαρτυρέω.

Mt Diff Lk 10x: ἔλεγεν, ἀπεκρίθη, ἐκβάλλω, λέγων (3x), ἐρεῖ (2x), βλασφημεῖ.

Mk Diff Mt 18x: λέγει (7x), προσήνεγκα, λέγουσιν (4x) ἔφη, ἐρεῖτε, κάλει, λέγων, εἰρηκότος.

Lk Diff Mk 46x: λέγει (16x), ἐδίδασκεν, ἔλεγεν (6x), λέγουσιν (6x), ἔφη (4x), λέγων, ἀπεκρίθη, λέγειν (3x).

Lk Diff Mt 7x: λέγει (2x) εἴπητε.

These figures depend on text-critical judgments, but serve to illustrate the spread of variants and the patterns of interchange in relation to ἔφη and εἶπεν. The claims of Schulz and Weiser in respect of ἔφη are not sustainable.

Weiser, *Knechtsgleichnisse*, 242f, gives four other arguments for the redactional character of 25:21: 1) Luke has no parallel; 2) the reward, like the punishment in v 30, is presented in a transferred sense defined by the referent, and the punishment is redactional; 3) the redactor includes this parable in a series of eschatological parables; 4) the sentence contains Matthean language, e.g. χαρά is used allegorically. The most significance of these is 4); see n.219 below.

[219] χαρά has at least four possible references here: 1) enjoyment of a good life, as in *Cor Fab Aesop* 283:5; 2) feasting, as in Esther 9:17 and Numbers R 10:5; 3) festival, as in bBer 49a (see Joüon, *Notes*, 349; Schlatter, *Matthäus*, 722); 4) heaven, as in Lk 15:7,10; 1QH 13:6;18:15; 4Q 'Amram^{e} fr 1, lines 11-12; Pes de RKahana 27:2 on Ps 16:11; Ex R 25:8.

into the Wedding Feast, and alongside the warning that even a 'fast' must possess the spirit of joy.[220] In that sense it is allegorical; the context overlays the text with new levels of meaning. But that is true of all parables and not only the Matthean.

3) 'After a long time' (Mt 25:19).

The phrase belongs with popular narration. The parable requires a time lapse in order for the commercial operations to be completed, or not completed, as the case may be; and, although Luke's version lacks any explicit reference to the passage of time, the passage of time is implied by the progress of the king. Again, as in the case of 25:21,23, the origin of the phrase matters little. In the Matthean context, within the eschatological discourse built upon Mark, the phrase denotes the extensive period during which stewardship has to be excercised.[221] There is time to succeed; and there is time to fail. The emphatic Historic Present ἔρχεται underlines the point.

4) 'Into outer darkness' (Mt 25:30).

The punishment is given in the terms used for the wedding guest without a wedding garment in Mt 22:13, and for the replaced sons of the Kingdom in Mt 8:12. The replacement motif concern all who are 'unprofitable' (ἀχρεῖον 25:30).

5) θερίζω ὅπου οὐκ ἔσπειρα καὶ συνάγω ὅθεν οὐ διεσκόρπισα... (Mt 25:26c).

The third servant's dialogue with his master is a Matthean climax, achieved by varations of tense, vocabulary and order, distinguishing the advent of the third servant from both of the others, yet presenting all three within the same framework of narrative and language. The servant's defence is marked

---

[220] See p.346 n.249.

[221] μετὰ πολὺν χρόνον corresponds to Mt 24:48/Lk 12:45 and to the long absence implied in Lk 19:12 (for the problems this causes if Lk 19:11 is taken as literal temporal imminence, see Jeremias, *Parables*, 59; Marshall, *Luke*, 450, 702). Schulz, *Q*, 290, treats the phrase as redactional, and although Weiser argues that the time phrase could not have stood in Q (see 238 n.47), he recognizes that the time factor is crucial to a story involving the possible growth of capital investments (Mt 25:27). The linguistic materials supports this:

μετα + Accusative Schenk, 361; Neirynck, 285.

Mt 10x: 4x No Par; 5x Par Mk; 1x Diff Lk

Mk 9x: 5x Par Mt; 4x Diff Mt

Lk 12x: 8x No Par; 1x Diff Mk; 2x Diff Mt;1x No Par or Diff Mk.

χρόνος Schenk, 280; Neirynck, 332.

Mt 2x No Par; 1x Diff Lk; Mk 2x > ; Lk 7x: 4x No Par; 1 Diff Mt; 2x Diff Mk. Prabhu, *Quotations*, classes Mt 2x No Par as redactional, but his stylistic analysis of Mt 1-2 needs adjustment.

On this time phrase, see Grässer, *Problem*, 115 n.4, 117 n.5; Hoffmann, *Logienguelle*, 48; Green, *Matthew*, 205; Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 71.

by the greatest degree of similarity between the Matthew and the Luke up to that point in the parable.[222] In Matthew priority is given to the servant's assessment of his master. It is in two halves:[223] the first half is shared with Luke (Mt 25:24c/Lk 19:21b); the second differs from Luke. Matthew's first half is slightly narrower in sense than Luke: the master is 'one who reaps where he has not carried the responsibility and cost of sowing';[224] Luke's

---

[222] The third servant's defence marks the point of greatest similarity between the two Gospel accounts; the similarity concerns eight elements which are dealt with here in the Lucan order: (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h). The Matthean order is (a), (e), (f), (h), (c?), (b). In the Lucan order: (a) The opening word of the third servant's address is used by the first two servants also: κύριε. (b) In Matthew all the servants use ἴδε; in Luke only the third adds the parallel ἰδού. The Matthean τὸν σόν suggests a physical gesture; Derrett, *Law*, 25, traces the expression to the Mishnah and interprets it as upbraiding and defying his master, but the humour lies the characterization of the slave (Beavis, *Slavery*, 37-54). (c) The construction ἦν εἶχον ἀποκειμένην, found only in the Lucan version of the parable (Lk 19:20), has parallels so distributed within the Lucan Gospel that they could be post-Q but pre-Lucan. ἔχω with a Predicative Participle is found six times in Luke: 4x No Par; 2x Diff Mt; the use is Lk 4:40 Diff Mk is nominal, not predicative. Mark has one use Diff Mt and Lk. Matthew has κρύπτω in 25:18 and 25 (see p.346 n.248). (d) ἐν σουδαρίῳ is, in view of the previous discussion, traditional, and is variously interpreted (Jeremias, *Parables*; 61; McGaughy, *Fear*, 239, takes the burial of the napkin as evidence that the third slave in Luke was punishable because he lacked integrity).

[223] The two Gospels agree in the double character of the third servant's defence of his fear, and very closely approximate to each other in one of the halves. They agree in the same way in the quotation of the slave's comment by the master. In the half in which they approximate to each other, the picture is of harvesting without sowing, or harvesting beyond what is sown. Luke has ὅ as against Matthew's ὅπου. In the other half, Luke has ὅ as against Matthew's ὅθεν.

ὅπου Schenk, 374; Gundry, 646; Neirynck, 293.

Mt 13x: 3x Par Mk; 4x Par Lk; 1x Diff Mk; 3x Diff Lk; 2x Diff Lk or No Par
Mk 15x: 3x Par Mt; 1x Diff Mt; 9x > ; 1x Diff Mt or >*Mt; 1x > or Diff Mt
Lk 5x: 4x Par Mt; 1x Par Mk

Mt 26:57 Diff Mk is a basis for the judgment that this is redactional in Matthew; but the Marcan usage points in the opposite direction. In the other half, Luke has ὅ as against Matthew's ὅθεν.

ὅθεν Schenk, 369; Gundry, 646; Neirynck, 290.

Mt 4x: 1x Par Lk; 1x Diff Mk; 2x Diff Lk (Mt 25:24,26). Lk 1x: 1x Par Mt

In Mt 14:7 Diff Mk ὅθεν means 'wherefore' (Schenk cites Acts 26:19 and Hebrews 6x). Judging by Luke's practice, here the Matthean ὅθεν is probably traditional.

[224] The Matthean version can only mean one who reaps where he has not sown. The simple sense is that he takes what does not belong to him, although the version could mean 'reaping undeserved punishment' or 'reaping what is self-sown' (Derrett, *Law*, 25 n.1). The Lucan version could mean 'reaping beyond what was sown' or 'reaping out of proportion to what was sown' (see Pesahim 87b).

version can mean 'one who reaps out of proportion to what he has sown'. Both mean in effect 'one who takes what does not belong to him'. In the second half, Luke's may be a popular maxim for a grasping person.[225] Matthew's second half uses the Verb διασκορπίζω,[226] which in the context might be translated 'winnowed' (see Ez 5:2 LXX), or 'sown' (Gen 49:7 offers an uncertain parallel here), or 'distributed charity' (2 Cor 9:9). συνάγων 'gathering' would then be the corresponding picture: distributing/gathering. συνάγω and διασκορπίζω could however be read as corresponding elements within a different picture, as a Jewish response to the Gentile mission, or even as securing the place of the Gentiles in the divine purpose: God is the one who deals with those whom he has no right to trouble himself with; God gathers into his kingdom proselytes and Gentiles whom he has never scattered to the four winds of the Diaspora. It is a saying with several senses: primarily a metaphor from an agricultural context, it has been transferred into quite different contexts. The transferred uses reveal a view of God as akin to a 'grasping capitalist'. The second hints at the underlying fear of some Jewish Christians, that the Gentiles have been given the easy role: when some have it given to them, why should others have to endure so much? As the study of Mt 25:31ff showed,[227] the eschatological discourse as a whole is moving towards a universal perspective of judgment which Matthew describes by means of fearsome traditional terms. Mt 25:24 points towards that culmination, and is suggesting that what is said about responsibility and commitment in Mt 25:31ff applies here also.

(iii) *The Tradition*

Sections three and four of the Matthean parable can each be divided into three parts. The third section heads each sub-section with προσελθών (25:20,22,24). The Matthean version here has rhyme, rhythm, assonance, repetition and form. It has variation and colour. The Lucan version is a skeleton. Third-person Verbs predominate. The order of words in direct speech is inverted when the second servant speaks, and the climax of the third servant is marked by brevity. Neither the Matthean nor the Lucan versions can be traced to the editorial work of the evangelist. In neither

---

[225] See Brightman, *Notes*, 158; Taylor, *Plato*, 432.

[226] διασκορπίζω would most naturally mean in this context 'winnow' (Ez 5:2 LXX) or just possibly 'sown' (Gen 49:7, where B reads διασπερῶ). The NT uses are in the sense of 'scattered' Mt 26:31/Mk 14:27/Zech 13:7, 'wasted' Lk 15:13; 16:1, or 'overthrown' Lk 1:51. The majority of LXX uses are of the Diaspora; see also Test Asher 7.2,6. Following θερίζων and συνάγων, the natural sense of διεσκόρπισας would be agricultural; but the choice of the unusual word suggests a secondary level, for which Matthew may have been responsible.

[227] See p. 259.

Matthew nor Luke is it possible to trace a common text behind the two versions.[228]

The tradition of this parable has been treated now in its four Matthean sections. The First Section had few links with Luke, but strong links with Mark. The Second Section was rhythmically uninteresting, without Lucan links, and an expansion of Section One. Section Three had close similarities with Luke; but each version was distinctive, and neither can be claimed to be nearer the original. The Matthean version had all the signs of an epic parable. Section Four was an area of close agreements in language (except for Mt 25:24c/Lk 19:21b, referred to above), particularly in the closing logion. Probably the development of the parable was from a kernel including Section Three, to which Section Four was added at the Q stage. The centre of the original parable then would have been a reflection on the harshness of God. McGaughy[229] identifies here a post-exilic maxim in which Yahweh's chosen people express their sense of abandonment in the task of guarding the traditions of their fathers. He supports this with a

---

[228] Weiser, *Knechtsgleichnisse*, 240, treats the repetition in the narrative as more than poetry and as indicative of a catechetical interest linking the Matthean tradition and the Matthean redaction (Strecker, *Weg*, 39f, and Trilling, *Wahre Israel*, 220f). Schulz, *Q*, 290, reconstructs the original Q text, arguing that Q introduced both of the first two slaves with καὶ ἐλθὼν ὁ...λέγων κύριε (see Schulz, 198 n.140). Three factors suggest a more complex solution: 1) προσέρχομαι is probably traditional; see pp. 75f; 2) παρεγένετο in Lk 19:16 is probably Lucan redaction, as the absolute uses in Lk 14:21, 19:16 and Acts 15x suggest, as against the pattern of interchange between ()ερχομαι and ()γινομαι which could point to traditional usage.

παραγίνομαι Schenk, 400; Gundry, 647; Neirynck, 301
Mt 3x: 1x No Par; 2x Diff Mk (Mk uses γίνομαι)
Mk 1x: 1x Diff Mt (ἦλθεν)
Lk 8x: 5x No Par; 1x Diff Mk; 2x Diff Mt (1x ἦλθεν;1x προσελθών)

3) λαβών rhyming with λέγων is probably pre-Matthean, as are the other uses of λαμβάνω. The shift from Aorist Participle to Perfect is unparalleled in the parables, with perhaps the Perfect in v24 indicating with additional structural and dramatic emphasis, that the servant is discovered to have held on to the money rather than burying it. There is a shift of participial tense from Present to Aorist in the Lucan form of *The Two Houses* (6:47,49), but that lacks the dramatic force of Mt 25:20,24. λαμβάνω is used in so many different ways that a conspectus necessarily gives an incomplete picture:

λαμβάνω Schenk, 331; Gundry, 645; Gaston, 76; Neirynck, 274; Bergemann, 116-117.
Mt 53x: 24x No Par; 13x Par Mk; 2x Pa Lk; 10x Diff Mk; 4x Diff Lk
Mk 20x: 13x Par Mt; 5x Diff Mt; 1x *Mt; 1x > Mt
Lk 22x: 8x No Par; 7x Par Mk; 2x Par Mt; 5x Diff Mk

On the relation of λαμβάνω to αἴρω, see Mt 5:40 Diff Lk 6:29 and Mt 16:9 Diff Mk 8:20 and the discussion in Bergemann, 114-118.

[229] McGaughy, *Fear*, 243.

rabbinic parable about the heavy responsibility of privilege: 'I will tell thee a parable. To what is the matter like? It is like a man with whom the king deposited something for safe keeping. Every day he wept and cried and said: "Alas! when shall I be free of the responsibility of this deposit?" And thou, Rabbi, hadst a son. He studied the Scriptures—the Torah, the Prophets, and the Writings, the Mishnah, the Halakoth and the Haggadoth, and then he departed sinless out of the world. Be comforted; thou hast given back intact that which was entrusted to thee' (Aboth de RNathan 14). But few people in the time of Jesus would have identified themselves with the third servant if this had been the purpose of this parable. Those who recognized the responsibility of suffering in God's mercy would not have seen themselves as 'hiding their deposit'.[230] Furthermore, if God had been understood as one who made harsh demands, and that is quite possible, it would have been probably in the form of a general response, not in the form of the response of one servant representing one group. The original parable which stands behind Section Three explored the dangers of reacting to the God of Jesus as a hard God. He must be seen as just, but also as one whose Kingdom offered new hope.

The 'harshness' of God may well have been a problem in the time of Matthew, for the Christian[231] as well as for the Jew. The predicament was how to understand God as both benefactor and judge. It was to answer this predicament that Matthew designed Mt 25:31ff, where the judge was one who was himself persecuted. 25:14ff may form part of the answer also. The 'talents' offered are many, and the responsibility to use them great. The demand made upon us is heavy and wide-ranging. Chrysostom (Homily LXXVIII:2-3) may well be interpreting the parable in accordance with Matthew's attitudes when he wrote that the talents are 'each person's ability, whether in the way of protection, or in money, or in teaching, or in what thing soever of kind'. But whatever endowment a Christian may have received, and whatever responsibility that implies, the inner attitudes of fear must be expelled by the inner resources of the Kingdom. Resentment at the demands of the Kingdom needs, like the evil spirit, to be exorcized. Otherwise, misunderstanding the nature of God leads to an inhibited use of God's gifts.

The rabbinic parallels are in several cases parables of confidence in divine mercy. The Midrash Rabbah on Deuteronomy provides a series of these in Ki Thabo 7:4; Debrim 1:13 and Ekeb 3:7. The blessings which the parables specify are righteousness, justice, loving kindness and mercy, and they range

---

[230] McGaughy was perhaps misled by the opening of the parable of Yahanan and failed to see that the parable is offered as comfort to the man who suffered a great deal in the cause of fidelity.

[231] Cope, *Matthew*, 73 n.131.

from the gift of a large household to the gift of the Lord's Kingdom. This aspect too, developed from the Deuteronomic associations of harvest in that it includes end-time and unlimited blessings, needs to be heard if the Matthean parable, with its extended epic character, is to be fully appreciated.

Behind Matthew's Gospel there was a parable of *The Talents* in an epic form. What can be said about that earlier stage? It resembled the developed Q forms which have been recognized in the parable of *The Unforgiving Servant* and *The Two Houses*. The vocabulary suggests this, e.g. συναίρει λόγον[232] (Mt 25:19b Diff Lk 19:15), as a stylized reference to financial negotiations. The structural use of vocabulary suggests this too, e.g. ἔδει σε οὖν (Mt 25:27 Diff Lk 19:23), which has a close parallel in Mt 18:33, with the Accusative placed after the Verb and the Infinitive immediately following. Considered against the six variations in the Lucan use of that construction, that is a noteworthy level of agreement.[233] The contrasting moral Adjective suggests this also: ὀκνηρέ, a Wisdom word meaning 'resentful, work-shy, impudent',[234] as part of the phrase involving homoeoteleuton πονηρέ δοῦλε καὶ ὀκνηρέ and its opposite δοῦλε ἀγαθὲ καὶ πιστέ in 25:21, where again the vocabulary achieves an imperious ring by means of assonance.[235]

---

[232] This is a schematized reference to financial negotiations such as we find also in Mt 18. The phrase is used absolutely in Mt 18 and in the Infinitive, whereas in Mt 25:19 it is accompanied by μετά and is in the Indicative. The influences to be traced in 25:19 are therefore likely to be cultural rather than literary and specifically dependent on 18:23. The Lucan version uses φωνηθῆναι, 'to be summoned'. Matthew has a similar use in Mt 20:32 (Par Mk) and 27:47 (Par Mk); Mk has two further uses in 1:26 (> Mt) and 9:35 (> Mt and Lk) and a repetition (3x in 10:49). Luke has a weakened sense in 8:8 (presumably Diff Mk); Lk 8:54 uses the word in the sense of 'shout' (Diff Mk). There is a parabolic use in the sense of 'invite' in Lk 14:12 No Par. This leaves 16:2 and 19:15 as distinctive and possibly Special Luke (see Weiser, *Knechtsgleichnisse*, 239). The use of the Accusative and Infinitive after εἶπεν as a Verb of Command could reflect a Lucan trait, but there is an interesting variation to be noted between Mk 5:43 and Lk 8:55.

[233] δεῖ Schenk, 166; Neirynck, 230.

Mt 8x: 4x No Par; 2x No Par; 1x Par Lk; 1x Diff Lk
Mk 6x: 4x Par Mt; 2x Diff Mt (13:10; 13:14)
Lk 18x: 12x No Par; 2x Par Mk; 1x Par Mt; 2x Diff Mk; 1x Diff Mt

Mt 23:23 is questioned on textual grounds: see Garland, *Matthew 23*, 139 n.65; Metzger, *Commentary*, 159; Marshall, *Luke*, 498. The case for retaining Lk 11:42 is good, if not overwhelming. If Mt 23:23/Lk 11:42 is accepted (with the Imperfect ἔδει), Mt 25:27 could also be regarded as some form of Q material, although there is no explicit Accusative in Mt 23:23, whereas there is in Mt 25:27.

[234] Jones, *Matthew, 18*, 237ff.

[235] πιστός and φρόνιμος appear together in Mt 24:45 and Lk 12:42, in Matthew with καί to link them, in Luke without καί (see Turner, *Grammar*, III

(iv–v) *The History of the Parables and the History of Redaction*
This parable has a unique history. Its fourfold form in Matthew is the result of its tradition history, and its function as an extended epic parable depends on that fourfold form. Its interpretation also gives it a unique status.[236] Instead of having a different level of interpretation from the level of its narration, the level of the narrative is one of the levels of its interpretation. The parable is about working with material things, and its interpretation includes that level of reference. From the redactional point of view it raises once more the riddle of Marcan and Q material in a pre-Matthean combination, and suggests that 25:14ff should be heard as a rising crescendo moving toward the Final Judgment.

Conclusion to Chapter Seven

The eschatological discourse has a dramatic form. *The Fig Tree* refers to the events which will indicate the coming of the end-time, in its fearfulness and promise. Editorial touches reveal the adaptability of the sources' forms and figures. The length of the period of waiting is not to be revealed and this transforms the original triplet of parables into paraenetic material. The dangers of a false sense of security and unthinking carelessness are attached through the addition of 24:37-41, and through the strong resonances within the parable group. *The Talents* gives the benefits and demands of God day-by-day significance and this prepares the way for the massive structure of the final parable in which daily behaviour is judged by the King, as, in a vision, the far-off moment of reckoning becomes a present reality.

The scale of the parables in this discourse differs from each one to the next: *The Thief* is extended metaphor, *The Two Servants* resembles features of *The Two Houses* in its style, organization, contrasts and balances, *The*

186, who notes the tendency to place Adjectives before and after the Noun rather than both before and after, as is the case in Mt 25:21). This is by no means the only link between Mt 25:14ff and Mt 24:45ff/Lk 12:42ff (see καταστήσει Mt 24:47 Diff Lk 12:44 and Mt 25:21,23, although the case after ἐπί differs from one context to the other). The distribution of predicates before and after the Noun is found in both versions of his parable (on πιστός Weder, *Gleichnisse*, 198 n.141; Dupont, *Talents*, 381ff). The order of words in Matthew 25:21 may be of some significance. Why does it not read ἀγαθὲ δοῦλε καὶ πιστέ? If καὶ πιστέ is simply a Matthean addition, or even an addition of the Matthean tradition, the order would probably have been ἀγαθὲ δοῦλε καὶ πιστέ. A possible answer might be that the rhythm of the latter is less satisfactory than the rhythm in 25:26, where assonance helps the description to sound authoritative.

[236] For interpretations which relate the parable closly to the Kingdom, see Förster, *Pfunden*, 37-56; Didier, *Talents*, 248-271; Weder, *Gleichnisse*, 206f; Weiser, *Knechtsgleichnisse*, 264.

Young Women is retained as a classic epic. Longer still is *The Talents,* having outgrown its earlier stages and become an extended epic. Last of all, there is the unique construction of *The Sheep and The Goats.*

The level of interest for the various parts of the discourse is similar. The division of human beings at the Judgment is sudden, without any route for escape. The present time is thus of the utmost significance. In it the will of God is to be fulfilled in the details of everyday life. This level of interest gives a seriousness to the details of daily life and is parallel to the concerns expressed in relation to church discipline in Matthew 18. But the criteria of judgment in the two passages are differently conceived. In Matthew 18 they are particular and ecclesial; in Mt 25:31ff they are universal and fundamental. The relationship of daily behaviour to judgment and reward is also differently conceived in the two passages. In Matthew 18 the decisions are clear-cut, and behaviour which breaks the rules is punished by exclusion from the community. In Matthew 25 it is the unsuspecting acts of mercy which are honoured and the absence of those acts which merits the ultimate penalty.

APPENDIX: THE GENITIVE ABSOLUTE

In many respects this Appendix is the linchpin of the book. It contains a study of the Genitive Absolute which makes five contributions to the argument of the book (p.51). First, it illustrates the method of statistical research outlined on p.15 and used in the basic research for the book. It brings together computer, synoptic, grammatical, textual, historical and structuralist methods in a way which shows each to be corrective of the other. Second, the Genitive Absolute is often referred to in redaction-critical work. A classic example of its use was quoted from the work of Tevis (p.9), where as a construction it was treated as an indication of Matthean editorial preference. This Appendix shows how unreliable that judgment is. Third, this study shows more clearly than any previous syntactical study the development of formulaic language within the synoptic tradition and particularly its development in the post-Marcan period (p.54). It opens the door to an important new area of synoptic research. Fourth, the study confirms Hartman's judgment on the nature of synoptic language, that it represents an 'in collegia' form of communication (p.53). Fifth, it affirms the conserving process at work in Matthew's Gospel, providing a grammatical underpinning for the thesis of the book.

This Appendix provides two overall surveys of the use of the Genitive Absolute.

A. An overall statistical survey of uses of the Genitive Absolute through the entire New Testament.

The summaries display the uses of the Genitive Absolute according to six constructions:

CONSTRUCT	1	Noun + Participle (in that order)
CONSTRUCT	2	Participle + Noun
CONSTRUCT	3	Pronoun + Participle
CONSTRUCT	4	Participle + Pronoun
CONSTRUCT	5	Adjective + Participle
CONSTRUCT	6	Participle + Adjective

(i) TOTAL NUMBER OF USES IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

BOOK	CON 1	CON 2	CON 3	CON 4	CON 5	CON 6		TOTAL	WORDS IN BOOK
MT	28	13	10	21	5	0	=	77	(18363)
MK	16	12	6	17	4	2	=	57	(11313)
LK	17	13	15	23	7	5	=	80	(19496)
JN	16	3	9	2	3	0	=	33	(15675)
ACTS	45	43	19	33	12	11	=	163	(18469)
ROM	11	5	3	0	3	2	=	24	(7114)
1 COR	1	1	1	0	1	0	=	4	(6840)
2 COR	6	2	1	0	0	0	=	9	(4488)
GAL	12	1	0	0	1	0	=	14	(2233)
EPH	5	2	0	2	1	1	=	11	(2423)
PHIL	1	0	0	0	1	0	=	2	(1631)
COL	2	0	0	0	0	0	=	2	(1582)
1 THESS	7	1	0	0	0	1	=	9	(1482)
2 THESS	2	0	0	0	0	0	=	2	(823)
1 TIM	6	1	0	0	1	0	=	8	(1591)
2 TIM	3	1	0	1	1	0	=	6	(1239)
TITUS	1	0	0	0	0	0	=	1	(659)
PHILEMON	0	0	0	0	0	0	=	0	(335)
HEBREWS	10	9	1	2	4	3	=	29	(4956)
JAMES	3	0	0	0	0	0	=	3	(1745)
1 PETER	5	5	0	1	1	1	=	13	(1685)
2 PETER	4	2	1	1	1	1	=	10	(1099)
1 JOHN	0	0	0	0	0	0	=	0	(2141)
2 JOHN	0	0	0	0	0	0	=	0	(245)
3 JOHN	1	1	0	0	0	0	=	2	(219)
JUDE	1	0	0	0	0	0	=	1	(461)
REVELATN	42	0	0	1	20	0	=	63	(9856)
TOTALS	245	115	66	104	66	27	=	623	(138163)

(ii) FREQUENCIES: OCCURRENCES PER 1000 WORDS OF TEXT

BOOK	CON 1	CON 2	CON 3	CON 4	CON 5	CON 6	TOTAL
MT	1.525	0.708	0.545	1.144	0.272	0.000	4.193
MK	1.414	1.061	0.530	1.503	0.354	0.177	5.038
LK	0.872	0.667	0.769	1.180	0.359	0.256	4.103
JN	1.021	0.191	0.574	0.128	0.191	0.000	2.105
ACTS	2.437	2.328	1.029	1.787	0.650	0.596	8.826
ROM	1.546	0.713	0.422	0.000	0.422	0.281	3.374
1 COR	0.146	0.146	0.146	0.000	0.146	0.000	0.585
2 COR	1.337	0.446	0.223	0.000	0.000	0.000	2.005
GAL	5.374	0.448	0.000	0.000	0.448	0.000	6.270
EPH	2.064	0.825	0.000	0.825	0.413	0.413	4.540
PHIL	0.613	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.613	0.000	1.226
COL	1.264	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.264
1 THESS	4.723	0.675	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.675	6.073
2 THESS	2.430	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	2.430
1 TIM	3.771	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.629	0.000	5.028

2 TIM	2.421	0.807	0.000	0.807	0.807	0.000	4.843
TITUS	1.517	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.517
PHILEMON	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
HEBREWS	2.018	1.816	0.202	0.404	0.807	0.605	5.851
JAMES	1.719	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.719
1 PETER	2.967	2.967	0.000	0.593	0.593	0.593	7.715
2 PETER	3.640	1.820	0.910	0.910	0.910	0.910	9.099
1 JOHN	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
2 JOHN	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
3 JOHN	4.566	4.566	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	9.132
JUDE	2.169	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	2.169
REVELATN	4.261	0.000	0.000	0.101	2.029	0.000	6.392

FREQUENCIES FOR THE ENTIRE TEXT BY INDIVIDUAL CONSTRUCTS:

CONSTRUCT	1	=	1.773
CONSTRUCT	2	=	0.832
CONSTRUCT	3	=	0.478
CONSTRUCT	4	=	0.753
CONSTRUCT	5	=	0.478
CONSTRUCT	6	=	0.195

B. An overall survey of the relation of the elements of the Genitive Absolute as a circumstantial clause to the elements of the main sentence.

There are considerable problems in defining what is meant by the grammatical term Genitive Absolute, and since the items listed in this survey would differ according to varying definitions some consideration has at this point to be given to the matter of definition. The definition used here will be that implied in Blass–Debrunner–Funk §417 and §423: a Genitive Absolute is the description given to an Adverbial Participle in the Genitive Case as an additional clause in the sentence. This means that the following examples are excluded from the list of Genitive Absolutes:

(i) Those Genitive Participles qualified by a Definite Article:
e.g. Mt 18:6; Mk 6:24; 9:42; Lk 1:71; 11:51; 14:10; 14:24; 20:46; Acts 1:16; 7:35; 12:12; 20:19.

(ii) Those Genitive Participles which are not adverbial:
e.g. Mt 21:16; 22:32; Mk 12:27; Lk 20:38; Acts 10:42; 18:7.

(iii) Those Genitive Participles which have a predicative force and do not imply an additional clause:

e.g. Mk 12:28 (= 'in dispute'); Lk 18:36 (= 'on its way').

(iv) Those Genitive Participles which, although they imply an additional clause, imply a clause descriptive of the Genitive Noun or Pronoun rather than a circumstantial clause:
e.g. Mt 26:75; Mk 14:58; Lk 22:44; Acts 2:11; 6:11; 7:58; 8:30; 10:46; 11:7; 14:9; 27:20.
By contrast Mt 26:7 is included = 'as he sat', i.e. a circumstantial clause.

(v) Those Genitive Participles qualifying a time-reference and therefore not implying in themselves an additional clause:
e.g. Jer 38:32; 43:3; 48:4.

Historical reasons might be given for including some of these within the list of entries. They are omitted from the B. survey below on the grounds that a stricter definition assists an analysis which deals specifically with the relation of the elements of the Genitive Absolute as a circumstantial clause to the elements of the main sentence. Their inclusion would have complicated the total picture without affecting the conclusions significantly.

The following abbreviations will be used:

(i) The synoptic relationships:

Mt	Par Mk	
	Diff Mk	
	Par Lk	
	Diff Lk	
	No Par	
Mk	Par Mt	
	Diff Mt	Reserved for where a Marcan item has a different Matthean counterpart.
	>*Mt	These three signs mark the gradations from where an item
	>*	in Mark is the only feature without parallel to cases where
	>	a whole section in Mark has no parallel in Matthew.

(ii) Features of the sentence:

P	Participle in Genitive case
N	Noun or Nominal Adjective in Genitive agreeing with the Participle
n	Pronoun in Genitive agreeing with the Participle
p	Preposition as an adjunct
a	Adverb or adverbial phrase, often as adjunct of Participle
A	Internal Accusative after Participle

O	Object of the Participle
◊	Adjectival Participle in Genitive
J	Adjective agreeing with N or n
j	Predicate qualifying N or n
i	Indirect Object to Participle
I	Adjunct in form of Indirect Speech
Q	Adjunct in form of Indirect Question
F	Adjunct in form of Infinitive
/x/	Feature absent in relevant parallel passage
C	Causal Clause
c	Comparative Clause
¢	Conditional Clause
©	Consequential Clause
!	Purpose Clause
R	Relative Clause
S	Direct Speech
T	Time Clause
∂	ἰδού
ø	Negative
D	Definite Article
E	ἔγενετο
*	Wild card

Sentence structure:

M	Main Sentence	
(V)	Verb	occurs first after Genitive Absolute
(P)	Participle	occurs first after Genitive Absolute
(N)	Noun	occurs first after Genitive Absolute
		similarly (a) (J) (n) (O) etc.
G	Genitive Absolute	

Particles:

k	καὶ
d	δὲ
m	μὲν
g	γὰρ
o	οὖν
H	ἤ
Ω	ὡς, ὡσεί
α	ἀλλά.

The tabulated material will appear in the following order:

Mt Par Mk; Diff Mk; Par Lk; Diff Lk; No Par
Mk Par Mt; Diff Mk; >*; >
Lk Par Mk; Diff Mk; Par Mt; Diff Mt; Mt >*; No Par
Acts
LXX

The tabulation provides in columns from left to right:

1. A numerical indicator; and the text reference.
2. The case of any Noun or Pronoun in the main sentence with the same referent as the Genitive of the Genitive Absolute. Incl. = Inclusive and indicates that the referent is included within the Noun or Pronoun; Dat. = Dative.
3. The position of the Genitive Absolute in the main sentence. In = Initial; Med = Medial; Fin = Final.
4. The Initial Particle.
5. Any adjuncts (mainly Prepositions).
6. The order of items WITHIN the Genitive Absolute.
7. The order of items OUTSIDE the Genitive Absolute.
8. Main vocabulary of the Genitive Participle and the Genitive Noun/Pronoun. Brackets ( ) indicate the grammatical form with which the main sentence begins.

MT PAR MK Uses of the Genitive Absolute in Matthew where Mark has a parallel.

1 Mt	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
1 8:16	-	In	d	-	NdP	G/ /M(V)	ὀψία γίνομαι
2 13:21	-	Med?	/d/	p διά	P /d/NHNp	MGM(a)	θλῖψις γίνομαι
3 14:15	-	In	/d/	-	N/d/ /P	GM(/V/)	/ὀψία/ γίνομαι
4 14:23	-	In	/d/	-	N/d/P	GM(/J/)	ὀψία γίνομαι
5 17:9	Dat Incl	In	k	p ἐκ	kPnp	GM(V)	καταβαίνω
6 20:29	/Dat/ Incl	In	k	p ἀπὸ	kPnp	GM(V)	ἐκπορεύομαι
7 24:3	/Dat/	In	/d/	p /ἐπί/	P/d/np	GM(V)	κάθημαι
8 26:6	/Dat/	In	/d/	pp ἐν	D/d/NPpp	GM(/V/)	/γίνομαι/
9 26:20	-	In	/d/	-	N/d/P	GM(V)	ὀψία γίνομαι
10 26:21	-	In	k	-	k/ /Pn	GM(/V/)	ἐσθίω

[11] 26:26	Gen + P	In	/d/		P/d/n	GM/P/	ἐσθίω
[12] 26:47	-	In	k	a	k/ /anP	G/∂/M(/N/)	λαλέω
[13] 27:57	-	In	/d/	-	N/d/P	GM(/V/)	ὀψία γίνομαι

MT DIFF MK Uses of the Genitive Absolute in Matthew where Mark has a parallel but not a Genitive Absolute.

1 Mt	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[14] 8:28 See 72	Dat	In	k	pp εἰς	k/P/n/pp	k/G/M(V)	ἔρχομαι
[15] 9:10	-	In	kE	p ἐν	kEn/P/p	kE/G/k/∂/M(J)	/ἀνά-/ κειμαι
[16] 9:18 See 73	/Dat/	In	-	-	/O/n/P/i/	/G/∂/M(/N/)	/λαλέω/
[17] 12:46	/Dat/ + Gen	In	-	/a/	/a/n/P/i/	/a/G/∂M(N)	/λαλέω/
[18] 13:6		In	/d/	-	N/d/P/	/G/M(V)	ἀνατέλλω
[19] 13:19	Gen	In	-	/J/	/J/P/O/køP	/G/M(V)	ἀκούω συνίημι
[20] 14:32		In	k	p εἰς	k/P/np	k/G/M(V)	ἀναβαίνω
[21] 17:5	/Acc/ Incl	In	-	/a/	/a/n/P/	/a/G/∂/M(N)k	/λαλέω/
[22] 17:14	Dat Incl	In	k	p πρὸς	k/P/p	k/G/M(V)	ἔρχομαι
[23] 17:22	Dat	In	/d/	p /ἐν/	/P/d/n/p	/G/M(V)	συστρέφω
[24] 21:10	-	In	k	p εἰς	k/P/n/p	k/G/M(V)	εἰσέρχομαι
[25] 21:23	Dat + P	In	k	p εἰς	k/P/n/p	k/G/M(V)	ἔρχομαι
[26] 22:41	/Acc/	In	/d/	-	/P/d/N/	/G/M(V)	συνάγω
[27] 26:60		Final			/J/P/N/	M/G/	προσέρχομαι
[28] 27:1		In	/d/		N/d/P	/G/M(N)	πρωΐα /γίνομαι/

MT PAR LK Uses of the Genitive Absolute in Matthew, agreeing with Luke in non-Marcan contexts.

1 Mt	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[29] 11:7		In	d		/n/dP	GM(V)	πορεύομαι

MT DIFF LK Uses of the Genitive Absolute in Matthew, disagreeing with Luke in common, non-Marcan contexts.

1 Mt	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
30 8:5	/Dat/	In	/d/	p εἰς	P/d/n/p	GM(V)	/εἰσέρχομαι/
31 16:2?	-	In			/N/ /P/	GM(V)	/γίνομαι/

MT NO PAR Uses of the Genitive Absolute in Matthew where no parallels are found.

1 Mt	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
32 1:18	Nomin + P	In	-	-	PDNji	GM(T)	μνηστεύω
33 1:20	Dat	In	d	-	OdnP	GθM(N)	ἐνθυμέομαι
34 2:1		In	d	pp ἐν	DdNPpp	GθM(N)	γεννάω
35 2:13		In	d		Pdn	GθM(N)	ἀναχωρέω
36 2:19		In	d		PdDN	GθM(N)	τελευτάω
37 5:1	Dat Incl	Medial	k	-	kPn	GM(V)	καθίζω
38 6:3	Gen	In	d		ndPO	GM(ø)	ποιέω
39 8:1	Dat	In	d	p ἀπό	Pdnp	GM(V)	καταβαίνω
40 9:32	-	In	d		ndP	GθM(V)	ἐξέρχομαι
41 9:33		In	k		kPDN	GM(V)	ἐκβάλλω
42 17:24		In	d	p εἰς	Pdnp	GM(V)	ἔρχομαι
43 17:26	Dat	Medial?	d	S	PdS	GM(V)	λέγω
44 18:24	Dat	In	d	F	PdnF	GM(V)	ἄρχομαι
45 18:25	Acc	In	d	F	øPdnF	GM(V)	ἔχω
46 20:8		In	d		NdP	GM(V)	ὀψία γίνομαι
47 25:5	-	In	d		PdDN	GM(V)	χρονίζω
48 25:10		In	d	F	PdnF	GM(V)	ἀπέρχομαι
49 27:17	Dat	In	o	-	Pon	GM(V)	συνάγω
50 27:19	Acc	In	d	p ἐπί	Pdnp	GM(V)	κάθημαι
51 28:11		In	d		Pdn	GθM(N)	πορεύομαι
52 28:13	-	Final	-		nP	MG	κοιμάομαι

MK PAR MT Uses of the Genitive Absolute in Mark where Matthew has a parallel. (The Matthean parallels are indicated in small type.)

1 Mk	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[53] 1:32 8.16	-	In	d	-	NdP	GTM(V)	ὀψία γίνομαι
[54] 4:17 13.21	-	Medial?		p διά /εἶτα/	/a/PNHNp	MGM(a)	θλῖψις γίνομαι
[55] 6:35 14.15	-	In	/k/	J /ἤδη/	/k/a/NJP	GM(/P/)	/ὥρα/ γίνομαι
[56] 6:47 14.23	-	In	/k/	-	/k/NP	GM(/V/)	ὀψία γίνομαι
[57] 9:9 17.9	Dat Incl	In	k	p ἐκ	kPnp	GM(V)	καταβαίνω
[58] 10:46 20.29		In	k	p ἀπό	kPnpkNkNj	GM/(N)/	ἐκπορεύομαι
[59] 13:3 24.3	/Acc/	In	/k/	p /εἰς/ p	/k/Pnpp	GM(V)	κάθημαι
[60] 14:3 26.6	Gen	In	/d/	pp ἐν	kPnppPn	G/G/M(V)	/εἰμί/ κατάκειμαι
[61] 14:17 26.20	-	In	/k/	-	/k/NP	GM(V)	ὀψία γίνομαι
[62] 14:18 26.21	-	In	k	-	k/Pn/kPDN	/G/GM(/N/)	/ἀνάκειμαι/ ἐσθίω
[63] 14:22 26.26	/Dat/	In	/k/		/k/Pn	GM(/P/)	ἐσθίω
[64] 14:43 26.47	-	In	k	εὐθύς ἔτι	k/a/anP	GM/ /(/V/)	λαλέω
[65] 15:42 27.57	-	In	/k/	/ἤδη/	/k/a/NP	GTRM(/P/)	ὀψία γίνομαι

MK DIFF MT Uses of the Genitive Absolute in Mark where Matthew has an alternative construction (which is added in Column Two below).

1 Mk	2 Case Mt's Alternative	3 Pstn	4 Ptcle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[66] 6:21	- Mt Dat Absolute	In	/k/	J	k/PNJ	/G/T See 67	ἡμέρα γίνομαι
[67] 6:22	/Nominative/ Mt Main Verb	Medial	/k/	j	/k/PDNj kP	/G/G/M(V)	εἰσέρχομαι ὀρχέομαι

[68] 9:28	/Genitive/ Mt Participle	In	/k/	p εἰς	/k/Pnp	/G/M(N)	εἰσέρχομαι
[69] 11:12	Nominative Incl Mt Participle	In	/k/	a p ἀπό	kaPnp	/G/M(V)	ἐξέρχομαι
[70] 11:27	Accusative See 25 Mt 21:23	In/Med	k	p ἐν	kpPn	GM(V)	περιπατέω
[71] 13:1	Dative Mt Participle	In	k	p ἐκ	kPnp	GM(V)	ἐκπορεύομαι
[72] 14:66	Accusative Mt Main Verb	In	k	a p ἐν	kPDNap	GM(V)	εἰμί
[73] 15:33	- Mt Preposition	In	k	p εἰς	kPNJ	GM(N)	ὥρα γίνομαι
[74] 16:2	 Mt Noun Phrase	Final	-	-	PDN	MG	ἀνατέλλω

MK >* Uses of Genitive Absolute in Mark where Matthew has parallels but no Genitive Absolute.

1 Mk	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[75] 5:2 See 14	Dat	In	k	p ἐκ	kPnp	GM(/a/)	ἐξέρχομαι
[76] 5:21 See 16	Acc	In	k	p ἐν ap εἰς	kPDNpap	GM(V)	διαπεράω
[77] 6:2	-	In	k		kPN	GM(V)	γίνομαι σάββατον
[78] 6:54	Acc Incl	In	k	-	kPnp	GM(a)	ἐξέρχομαι
[79] 10:17	Acc	In	k	p εἰς	kPnp	GM(P)	ἐκπορεύομαι
[80] 11:11		Med	-	a	jaPDN	PGM(V)	εἰμί ὥρα
[81] 14:3	Gen	Med	-		Pa	G/G/M(V)	κατάκειμαι
[82] 16:1	-	In	k		kPDN	GM(N)	διαγίνομαι σάββατον

MK > Uses of Genitive Absolute in Mark where Matthew has no parallel.

1 Mk	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[83] 4:35	-	Med	-	-	NP	MGS	ὀψία γίνομαι
[84] 5:18	Acc	In	k	p εἰς	kPnp	GM(V)	ἐμβαίνω
[85] 5:35	-	In	-	a ἔτι	anP	GM(V)	λαλέω
[86] 8:1	- -	In Med	- k	ap ἐν -	pajNP køPQ	GGQM(P)	εἰμί ἔχω

LK PAR MK Uses of Genitive Absolute in Luke where Mark has parallels, including the Genitive Absolute.

1 Lk	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[87] 4:40 See 1.53	-	In	d	-	Pd/D/N	G//M(/J/)	ἥλιος δύνω
[88] 8:49 See 85	-	In	-	a ἔτι	anP	GM(V)	λαλέω
[89] 9:37 See 5.57	Dat Incl?	In	d	/E/ /ἀπό/	/E/d/aPnp	GM(V)	/κατέρχομαι/
[90] 22:47 See 12.64	-	In	//	a ἔτι	anP	G/∂/M(/N/)	λαλέω

LK DIFF MK Uses of Genitive Absolute in Luke where Mark has parallels, but constructions other than the Genitive Absolute.

1 Lk	2 Case Mk's par Mt's par	3 Pos	4 Ptcl	5 Adj	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[91] 3:21	- Mk Indicative Mt Participle	Med	k	-	kNPkP	EdT/G/FkF/	βαπτίζω προσεύχομαι
[92] 4:42	- Mk Adverbs Mt -	In	/d/	-	PdN	/G/M(P)	ἡμέρα γίνομαι
[93] 8:4	- Mk Indicative Mt Indicative	In	d	-	PdNJkDp◊p	/G/M(V)	σύνειμι
[94] 8:23	Nomin. Inclusive Mk Noun πλοῖον Mt Noun πλοῖον	In	d	-	Pdn	/G/M(V)	πλέω
[95] 8:45	- Mk No Gen Abs Mt No Parallel	In	k	-	PdN	/G//M(V)	ἀρνέομαι
[96] 9:34 See 146	Accus Inclusive Mk No Gen Abs Mt Gen Abs See 21	In	d	-	OdnP	/G//M(V)	λέγω
[97] 9:42	Accusative Mk Indicative Mt No Parallel	In	/d/	a ἔτι	a/d/Pn	/G/M(V)	προσέρχομαι

[98] 9:43	- Mk No Parallel Mt Gen Abs See 23	In	/d/	p	N/d/PpR	/G/M(V)	θαυμάζω
[99] 18:40	Accusative Mk No Gen Abs Mt No Parallel	In	/d/	-	P/d/n	/G/M(V)	ἐγγίζω
[100] 19:33	Accusative Mk Indicative Mt > *	In	/d/		P/d/nO	/G/M(V)	λύω
[101] 19:36	- Mk No Gen Abs Mt No Gen Abs	In	/d/		P/d/n	/G/M(V)	πορεύομαι
[102] 20:1 Beyer 60f	Accusative Mk Indicative Mt Gen Abs See 25	In	k	pp E 2x ἐν	k/E/aPnOp kP	/G/M(V)	διδάσκω εὐαγγελίζομαι
[103] 20:45	- Mk Indicative Mt No Parallel	In	/d/		PdJDN	/G/M(V)	ἀκούω
[104] 21:5	- Mk Indicative Mt No Parallel	In	k	p περί	knPpI	/G/M(V)	λέγω
[105] 22:10	Dative Mk Imperative Mt Imperative	In	-	p εἰς	/∂/Pnp	/G/M(V)	εἰσέρχομαι
[106] 22:55	Genitive Mk Indicative Mt Indicative	In	/d/	p ἐν	P/d/OpkP	/G/M(V)	περιάπτω συγκαθίζω
[107] 23:45	- Mk No Gen Abs Mt No Gen Abs	Fin	-	-	DNP	MG	ἐκλείπω
[108] 24:5	Accusative Mk Indicative Mt Probition	In	/d/	p εἰς	jdPnkPOp	/G/M(V)	ἔμφοβος γίνομαι Mt /φοβέομαι/

LK PAR MT Uses of the Genitive Absolute in Luke, agreeing with Matthew in non-Marcan contexts.

1 Lk	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[109] 7:24		In	d		PdDNj	GM(V)	ἀπέρχομαι

LK DIFF MT Uses of Genitive Absolute in Luke, disagreeing with Matthew in common, non-Marcan contexts.

1 Lk	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[110] 4:2	-	Med	k	-	Pn	GM(V)	συντελέω
[111] 6:48	-	In	/d/	-	N/d/P	GM(V)	γίνομαι
[112] 11:14	-	In	/d/	E	E/d/DNP	GM(V)	ἐξέρχομαι

LK >*MT Uses of Genitive Absolute in Luke, absent from Matthew in common non-Marcan contexts.

1 Lk	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[113] 7:6	Dat	In	d	a ἤδη p ἀπό	adnøaPp	GM(V)	ἀπέχω
[114] 9:57	-	In	k	p ἐν	kPnp	GM(V)	πορεύομαι
[115] 19:11	-	In	d	-	PdnO	GM(P)	ἀκούω

LK NO PAR Uses of the Genitive Absolute in Luke where no parallels are found.

1 Lk	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[116] 2:2	-	Fin	-	-	PON	MG	ἡγεμονεύω
[117] 2:42 2:43	Nom Incl	Med	-	p κατά	Pnp kPO	TG GTM(V)	ἀναβαίνω τελειόω
[118] 3:1	-	Med	-		1.PNO 2.PON 3.NjPOO 4.NOP	pGGGGp M(V)	ἡγεμονεύω τετραρχέω
[119] 3:15	Dat	In	d k	pp ἐν περί	PdDN kPNppQ	GGQM(V)	προσδοκάω διαλογίζομαι
[120] 7:42	Dat	In		-	øPnF	GM(O)	ἔχω
[121] 11:53	Acc	In	(ka)	-	aPn	GM(V)	ἐξέρχομαι
[122] 12:1	-	Med	-	-	PDNj	RG©M(V)	ἐπισυνάγω
[123] 12:36	Dat	Med	-	-	PkP	MT?!G	ἔρχομαι
[124] 13:17	Dat	In	k	-	kOPn	GM(V)	λέγω
[125] 14:29	Dat	Med	k	-	PnO køPF	!øGP	τίθημι ἰσχύω
[126] 14:32	Med	In	-	a j	anjP	øøGM(N)	εἰμί
[127] 15:14	(Nom)	In	d		PdnO	GM(V)	δαπανάω
[128] 15:20	Acc	In	d	a ἔτι	adnaP	GM(V)	ἀπέχω
[129] 17:12	-	In	k	p εἰς	kPnp	GM(V)	εἰσέρχομαι

[130] 19:37	-	In	d	a ἤδη p πρός	Pdnap	GM(V)	ἐγγίζω
[131] 21:26	Gen	Fin		p ἀπό	PNp	MG	ἀποψύχω
[132] 22:59	-	In	k	-	kPΩNJ	GM(J)	διΐστημι
[133] 22:60	-	Med	-	a	aPn	aGM(V)	λαλέω
[134] 24:36	-	In	d	-	OdnP	GM(J)	λαλέω
[135] 24:41		In	d	a	anPnpkP	GM(V)	ἀπιστέω

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES Uses of the Genitive Absolute.

1 Mt	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[136] 1:8	-	Med	-	p ἐπί	PDJNp	MGkM	ἐπέρχομαι
[137] 1:9	Gen	Med	-	-	Pn	PGM(V)kM	βλέπω
[138] 1:10	-	Med	-	-	Pn	TGk∂M(N)	πορεύομαι
[139] 2:6	-	In	d	-	PdDNJ	GM(V)	γίνομαι
[140] 3:11	Acc Incl	In	d	-	PdnOkO	GM(V)	κρατέω
[141] 3:13	Gen	Fin	-	-	PnF	MRG	κρίνω
[142] 4:1	Dat	In	d	p πρός	Pdnp	GM(V)	λαλέω
[143] 4:31	(Nom)	In	k		kPn	GM(V)	δέομαι
[144] 4:37	-	Med	-	-	PiN	MRGM(P)	ὑπάρχω
[145] 5:2	-	Med	-	-	PkDN	MGM(kP)	σύνοιδα
[146] 5:15	Gen	Med	-		PN	M©!G	ἔρχομαι
[147] 6:1	Gen Incl	Med	-		PDN	pGM(V)	πληθύνω
[148] 7:5	-	Fin	-	-	øPiN	MG	εἰμί
[149] 7:21	Acc (Nom)	In (Med)	d		Pdn	(M)GM(V)	ἐκτίθημι
[150] 7:30	-	In	k	-	kPNJ	GM(V)	πληρόω
[151] 7:31	-	In?	d	-	PdnF	GM(E)	προσέρχομαι
[152] 9:8	- -	Med	d	-	PdDNj	MGM(O)	ἀνοίγω
[153] 9:38		In	d	a - ἐγγύς	adPNa	GM(N)	εἰμί
[154] 10:9	-	In	-	a	(a)PnkiP	(a)GM(V)	ὁδοιπορέω ἐγγίζω
[155] 10:10		In	d	-	Pdn	GM(V)	παρασκευάζω
[156] 10:19		In	d	p περί	DdNPp	GM(V)	διενθυμέομαι
[157] 10:44		In	-	a ἔτι	aPDNO	GM(V)	λαλέω
[158] 12:13	(Gen)	In	d		PdnO	GM(V)	κρούω
[159] 12:18	-	In	-	-	Pdn	GM(V)	γίνομαι ἡμέρα
[160] 13:2	-	In	d		PdnikP	GM(V)	λειτουργέω νηστεύω

[161] 13:24	-	Fin	-	p O +Gen	PNpO	MG	προκηρύσσω
[162] 13:42	Dat	In	d		Pdn	GM(V)	ἔξειμι
[163] 13:43	-	In	d	-	PdDN	GM(V)	λύω
[164] 14:20		In	d	-	PdDNO	GM(P)	κυκλόω
[165] 15:2	-	In	d	π πρός	PdNkNJiip	GM(V)	γίνομαι
[166] 15:7	-	In	d		JdNP	GM(P)	γίνομαι
[167] 16:16	Dat	Med	-	p εἰς	Pnp	EGM(N)	πορεύομαι
[168] 16:35	-	In	d	-	NdP	GM(V)	γίνομαι ἡμέρα
[169] 17:16	Gen	In	d	p ἐν	pdPODN	GM(V)	ἐκδέχομαι
[170] 18:6	Acc	In	d	-	PdnkP	GM(P)	ἀντιτάσσω βλασφημέω
[171] 18:12	-	In	d	-	NdjPj	GM(V)	εἰμί
[172] 18:14	-	In	d	-	PdDNF	GM(V)	μέλλω
[173] 18:20	-	In	d	a ἐπί	PdnaF	GM(V)	ἐρωτάω
[174] 18:21	-	Med	-	-	DNP	PSMGM(V)	θέλω
[175] 18:27	Acc	In	d	p εἰς	PdnFp	GM(P)	βούλομαι
[176] 19:6	-	In?	k	-	kPiDNO	GM(V)	ἐπιτίθημι
[177] 19:30	Acc	In	d	p εἰς	NdPFp	GM(V)	βούλομαι
[178] 19:33		Fin	-	-	PODN	MG	προβάλλω
[179] 19:36	-	In	o		joPn	GM(V)	εἰμί
[180] 19:40		Med	-	-	øjP	MGR(M?)	ὑπάρχω
[181] 20:3	-	In	-	p	PNipiF	GM(V)	γίνομαι
[182] 20:7	Dat Incl	Med	d	a	adPnF	GM(N)	συνάγω
[183] 20:9		Med	-	a	PDNa	PPGM(P)	διαλέγομαι
[184] 21:5	-	Med	-	p σύν p	PONpp	PMGkM(P)	προπέμπω
[185] 21:10	Acc	In	d	a	Pda	GM(V)	ἐπιμένω
[186] 21:14	-	In	d	-	øPdn	GM(V)	πείθομαι
[187] 21:17	Acc	In	d	p εἰς	Pdnp	GM(a)	γίνομαι
[188] 21:31	-	In	τε	-	PτεOF	GM(V)	ζητέω
[189] 21:34	Nom	In	d	p διά	øPdnFp	GM(V)	δύναμαι
[190] 21:40a b	- -	In In	d d	- -	Pdn JdNP	GM(N) GM(V)	ἐπιτρέπω γίνομαι
[191] 22:23	-	In	τε	p εἰς	PτεnkPOk OPp	GM(V)	κραυγάζω ῥιπτέω βάλλω
[192] 23:7	-	In	d	-	OdnP	GM(E)	λαλέω
[193] 23:10	-	In	d	-	JdPN	GM(P)	γίνομαι
[194] 23:12	-'	In	d	-	PdN	GM(P)	γίνομαι ἡμέρα
[195] 23:30	-	In	d	p εἰς	PdiNpI	GM(a)	μηνύω
[196] 24:2a b	Nom -	In Med	d -	- p διά	Pdn NPip	GM(V) PkGM(a)	καλέω γίνομαι
[197] 24:10	-	Med	-	-	PiDN	MGFS	νεύω

[198] 24:11	Acc	Med	-	-	PnFI	MGR	δύναμαι
[199] 24:25	-	In	d	p περί	Pdnp	GM(J)	διαλέγομαι
[200] 24:27		In	d		Ndp	GM(V)	πληρόω
[201] 25:7	Acc	In	d	-	Pdn	GM(V)	παραγίνομαι
[202] 25:8	Acc	Fin	-	-	DNPS	- G	ἀπολογέομαι
[203] 25:13	-	In	d	-	NdPJ	GM(N)	διαγίνομαι ἡμέρα
[204] 25:17	- -	In	o	a	Po(n?)a	GM(N)	συνέρχομαι
[205] 25:21	Acc	In	d	p εἰς	DdNPIp	GM(V)	ἐπικαλέομαι
[206] 25:23a b c	-	Med	- k k	p μετά pp εἰς -	PDNkDNp kPpp kPDN	GkGkGM(V)	ἔρχομαι εἰσέρχομαι κελεύω
[207] 25:25	Acc	Med	d	-	JdnPO	MGM(V)	γίνομαι
[208] 23:10	-	Med	-	-	DNP	M!G!	γίνομαι
[209] 26:10	Acc	Med	τε	-	Pτεn	MGM(V)	ἀναιρέω
[210] 26:14	Nom Incl	Med	τε -	p εἰς	JτεPnp	MGM(V)	καταπίπτω
[211] 26:24	-	In	d	-	OdnP	GM(N)	ἀπολογέομαι
[212] 27:2	-	Fin	-	p σύν	PpNJ	MG	εἰμί
[213] 27:7	-	Med	-		øPODN	PGM(V)	προσεάω
[214] 27:9a b	-	In In	d k	- a ἤδη	JdNP kPajDNC	GkGM(V)	διαγίνομαι εἰμί
[215] 27:12	-	In	d	p πρός	jdDNPp	GM(N)	ὑπάρχω
[216] 27:13	-	In	d	-	Pdn	GM(P)	ὑποπνέω
[217] 27:15a b	-	In	d k	-	PdDN køPF	GkGM(P)	συναρπάζω δύναμαι
[218] 27:18	Nom Incl	In	d	a a	adPna	GM(N)	χειμάζω
[219] 27:20a b	-	In	d τε	a	ødNøNPa NτεJP	GM(a)	ἐπιφαίνω ἐπίκειμαι
[220] 27:21	-	In	τε	-	JτεNP	GM(a)	ὑπάρχω
[221] 27:30a b		In	d k	p ἐκ p εἰς	DdNPFp kPOpΩ◊F	GkGM(V)	ζητέω χαλάω
[222] 28:3a b	Gen	In	d k	 p ἐπί	PdDNO kPp	GkGM(N)	συστρέφω ἐπιτίθημι
[223] 28:6	Nom	In	d	a	adnPkPI	GM(P)	προσδοκάω θεωρέω
[224] 28:9	-	In	d	-	NdP	GM(N)	γίνομαι
[225] 28:13	-	Med	-	-	PN	pGM(J)	ἐπιγίνομαι
[226] 28:17	Acc	In	d	-	PdN	GM(V)	συνέρχομαι
[227] 28:19	-	In	d		PdDN	GM(V)	ἀντιλέγω
[228] 28:25	- -	Med	-	-	PDNOS	MGS	λέγω

THE LXX Uses of the Genitive Absolute.

1 Genesis	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[229] 18:1	Dat	Fin	-	p ἐπί a	Pnpa	MG	κάθημαι
[230] 23:10	-	Med	-	-	PNkJNp	MGPS	ἀκούω
[231] 29:6 MS A only	-	In	-	a ἔτι	anP	GkϑM(N)	λαλέω
[232] 29:9	-	In	-	a ἔτι	anP	GkM(N)	λαλέω
[233] 44:4	Nom Incl	In	d		PdnO	GM(V)kMS	ἐξέρχομαι
[234] 44:26	- -	Fin	-	p μετά	DNDJøPp	MG	εἰμί
[235] 44:34	-	Fin	-	p μετά	DNøPp	MG	εἰμί
[236] 48:7	(Nom)	Fin	-	p κατά a	Pnpa	TMGkM	ἐγγίζω

1 Exodus	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[237] 2:10	Acc	In	d	-	PdDN	GM(V)	ἀδρύνω
[238] 4:21	Nom	Med	-	p εἰς	PnkPp	MSGM(V)	πορεύομαι ἀποστρέφω
[239] 5:20	Nom Dat	Fin	d	p ἀπό	Pnp	M(V)G	ἐκπορεύομαι
[240] 12:18	Nom	In	-	a p ἀπό	Pap	GM(V)	ἐνάρχομαι
[241] 12:29	-	In	d	-	EdPDN	GkM(N)	μεσόω
[242] 19:16	-	In	d	a p πρός	EdaPp	GkM(E)	γίνομαι
[243] 33:8	-	Fin	-	-	PN	M(V)GT	ἄπειμι
[244] 34:29	Nom	In	d	p ἐκ	Pdnp	GM(N)	καταβαίνω

1 Leviticus	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[245] 10:9	Nom	Med	-	p πρός	ηPnp	MSTηGk©!	προσ- πορεύομαι
[246] 16:17	(Nom) -	Med	-	p ἐν -	PnFp	M(kJN)GT	εἰσπορεύομαι
[247] 19:9	Nom	In	k	-	kPnO	GM(øV)kM	ἐκθερίζω
[248] 26:36	-	Fin	-	-	øP	kMkMkMG	διώκω οὐδείς
[249] 26:37	-	Med	-	-	øP	kMGkM	κατατρέχω οὐδείς
[250] 26:44	Acc	In	k	p ἐν	køΩPnp	kGøM	εἰμί
[251] 27:21	-	Med	-	-	PDN	αMGM	ἐξέρχομαι

1 Numbers	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
252 3:4	Nom -	Med	-	ἔναντι pp ἐν	PnOpp	kM(V)GkM	προσφέρω
253 4:19	Nom	Fin	-	p πρός	Pnp	kMkMG	προσ- πορεύομαι
254 6:7	Dat	Med	-	-	Pn	MGC	ἀποθνήσκω
255 9:22	-	Med	-	p ἐπί	PDNPp	aGGM(V)	πλεονάζω σκιάζω
256 34:8	-	Med	-	p εἰς	Pp	kMGkM	εἰσπορεύομαι

1 Deuteronomy	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
257 4:45	Dat	Med	-	p ἐκ	Pnp	M(n)RGp	ἐξέρχομαι
258 4:46	Nom	Fin	-	p ἐκ	Pnp	M(p)RRG	ἐξέρχομαι
259 6:4	Dat	Med	-	-	Pnp	M(n)RGS	ἐξέρχομαι
260 8:13	-	Med Med Med	k - k	-	kDNkDNPi NkNPi kNRPi	8:11-MμG G kGM 8:16	πληθύνω πληθύνω πληθύνω
261 9:9	-	Fin	-	-	PnFR	MG	ἀναβαίνω
262 11:19 (Codex B)	Incl Gen Gen Gen	Med Med Med Fin	- k k k	p ἐν p ἐν	Pnp kPnp kPn kPn	MGkGkGkG	κάθημαι πορεύομαι καθεύδω διανίστημι
263 15:10	Nom + Gen	Fin	-		Pni	MkMG	δίδωμι
264 15:18	-	Med	-	p ἀπό	Pnjp	MGC	ἐξαποστέλλω
265 23:12		Med	k	-	kPN	MkGM(V)	δύνω ἥλιος
266 24:9	(Nom) (Gen)	Fin	-	p ἐκ	Pnp	MRG	ἐκπορεύομαι
267 25:17	(Nom) Dat	Med	-	p ἐκ	Pnp	MRGI	ἐκπορεύομαι
268 31:27	-	In	g	p μετά	agnPpa	GM(V)	ζάω
269 33:5	-	Fin	-	p ἅμα	PNjp	kM(V)G	συνάγω

1 Joshua	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
270 4:23	-	Med	-	p ἐκ	PNjOpT	MSGc©!	ἀποξηραίνω
271 6:5	- -	In	k -	- -	kPn	GM(V)	ἀνακράζω

1 I Kings	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[272] 2:27	(Acc)	Fin	-	p ἐν	Pnpj	MS(P)G	εἰμί
[273] 9:5	(Nom)	In	-	p εἰς	nPp	GkM(N)	ἔρχομαι
[274] 9:11	Nom	In	-	-	nPA	GkM(n)	ἀναβαίνω
[275] 9:14	Gen	In	-	p εἰς	nPp	GkϑM(N)	εἰσπορεύομαι
[276] 9:27	(Dat)	In	-	p εἰς	nPp	GkM(N)	καταβαίνω
[277] 11:9	- -	Fin	- -	-	PDN	M(a)G	διαθερμαίνω ἥλιος
[278] 13:15	Acc	In	-	p ἐκ p εἰς	nPpp	GkM(V)	παραγίνομαι
[279] 15:2	Dat	Fin	-	p ἐκ	Pnp	MSTG	ἀναβαίνω
[280] 20:14	Gen	In	km		kmanP	GkM(V)	ζάω
[281] 24:2 cp. 14:33 + 23:1		Med	-		P	kMGS	λέγω
[282] 25:20	Gen	In	k	p ἐπί p ἐν	nPp kPp	kEG kGkϑM(N)	ἐπιβαίνω καταβαίνω
[283] 30:1	-	In	k	p εἰς	PNkDNp	kEGkM(N)	εἰσέρχομαι

1 II Kings	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[284] 3:13	Nom	Fin	-	-	PF	øMG	παραγίνομαι
[285] 11:1	-	In	-	p εἰς	PDNp	kEGkM(V)	ἐπιστρέφω
[286] 13:30	-	In	-	p ἐν	nPp	kEGkM(N)	γίνομαι
[287] 19:19	Gen	Fin	-	-	PnO	kMG	διαβαίνω

1 III Kings	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[288] 1:14	-	In	-	a a p μετά	aPnap	kϑGkM(n)	λαλέω
[289] 1:22	-	In	-	a p μετά	anPp	kϑGkM(N)	λαλέω
[290] 1:42	-	In	-	a	anP	GkϑM(N)	λαλέω
[291] 3:18	-	In	-	-	Pn	kEpGkM(V)	τίκτω
[292] 6:1	-	Med	-	p ἐπί	PDNp	kEppGkM(V)	βασιλεύω
[293] 12:6	Gen	Med	-	-	anP	kMRGS	ζάω
[294] 12:24L	Gen (Nom)	In	-	-	PnO	keGkM(N)	εἰσέρχομαι
[295] 12:24X	-	In	-	-	PDN	kEGkM(V)	ἐνίστημι
[296] 13:20	- -	In	-	- -	nP	kEGkEM(N)	κάθημαι
[297] 21:22 (20:22)	-	Med	-	-	PDN	kMSCG	ἐπιστρέφω ἑνιαυτός
[298] 21:26 (20:26)	-	In	-	-	PDN	kEGkM(V)	ἐπιστρέφω ἑνιαυτός

1 IV Kings	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[299] 2:11	Nom	In	-	-	nP	kEGM(V)	πορεύομαι
[300] 2:23	Gen	In	k	p ἐν	kPnp	kGkM(N)	ἀναβαίνω
[301] 3:20	-	In	k	a	PDN	kEaGkϑM(N)	ἀναβαίνω
[302] 6:33	- -	In	- -	a p μετά	anPp	GkϑM(N)	λαλέω
[303] 8:5	-	In	-	-	nPiI	kEGkϑ M(DN)	ἐξηγέομαι
[304] 8:21	Nom	In	-	-	nP	kEGkM(V)	ἀνίστημι
[305] 13:21	Nom	In	-	-	nPO	kEGkϑM(V)	θάπτω
[306] 19:37	Gen Acc	In	-	p ἐν	nPp	kEGk M(NkN)	προσκυνέω

1 I Chron	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[307] 12:1	Acc	Fin	-	a p ἀπό	aP[N]p	kMG	συνέχομαι
[308] 17:24	- (Acc)	Med	-	-	P	MGS	λέγω
[309] 18:3	Acc	Fin	-	-	PnF	kM(V)G	πορεύομαι

1 II Chron	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[310] 18:34	Acc	Fin	-	-	PDN	kM(V)G	δύνω ἥλιος
[311] 20:10	Dat (Nom)	Med	-	p ἐκ	Pnp	kaϑMGCkaϑ M	ἐξέρχομαι
[312] 21:5	Nom	In	-	-	Pnj	GM(V)	εἰμί
[313] 25:14 B	Acc	Med	-		PO	kEaGkM(V) kM	πατάσσω
[314] 36:10	-	In	k	-	kPDN	GM(V)	ἐπισρέφω ἑνιαυτός

1 I Esdras	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[315] 2:25	-	In	-	a τότε	aPD◊	kGM(DN)	ἀναγινώσκω
[316] 5:39	-	In	k	-	kjPDJNp køP	kGkGM(V)	ζητέω εὑρίσκω
[317] 5:46a b	- Nom	In In	d k	- p ἐν	PdDJN kPDNjjp	GkGM(V)	ἐνίστημι εἰμί
[318] 6:2	-	Fin	-		PDNj◊	aMG	σύνειμι
[319] 6:4	-	Med	-	-	niP	MSGM	προστάσσω
[320] 6:10		Med	-		niP	MSGM	προσταόσω

[321] 7:3	-	Fin	-	-	PNkNj	kMG	προφητεύω
[322] 8:1	-		-	-	PNi	kMGM	βασιλεύω
[323] 8:4	Dat	Fin	-	p p ἐπί	POpp	kMG	εὑρίσκω
[324] 8:6 ? B	Nom	In	-	p ἐκ	Pgpa	GM(V)	ἐξέρχομαι
[325] 8:8a b	-	In	d	p παρά p πρός	PdD◊NppR PppR	GS	προσπίπτω
[326] 8:61	-	In	k	-	kPaNJ	kGM(P)	γίνομαι
[327] 8:65	-	In	k	-	knP	kGM(V)	τελέω

1 II Esdras	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[328] 17:3	-	Med	k	a ἔτι	kanP	kMkGM(V)	γρηγορέω

1 Psalms	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[329] 7:3	-	Fin	-	-	øP◊ø◊	MG	εἰμί
[330] 103:28a b	- -	In In	- d	-	Pni PdnO	GM(V)	δίδωμι ἀνοίγω
[331] 103:29	-	In	d		PdnO	GM(V)	ἀποστρέφω

1 Proverbs	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[332] 3:28	Nom	Fin	-	-	jnPF	M(V)G	εἰμί
[333] 6:7	-	In	g		igNøP	GPPM	ὑπάρχω
[334] 10:25	-	In	-	-	NP	GM	παρα- πορεύομαι
[335] 11:7	-	In	-	-	PNJ	GM	τελευτάω
[336] 15:13a b	-	In	- d	- p ἐν	NP pdP	GM(N) GM(V)	εὐφραίνω εἰμί
[337] 28:1	-	Med	-		øP	M(V)G	διώκω
[338] 29:2a b	-	In	- d		PN PdN	GM(V) GM(V)	ἐγκωμιάζω ἄρχομαι
[339] 29:3	Gen	In	-	-	NPO	GM(V)	φιλέω
[340] 29:12	Acc	In	-	-	NPO	GM(J)	ἐπακούω
[341] 29:13	Gen	In	-	-	NkNiP	GM(N)	συνέρχομαι
[342] 29:14	Gen	In	-	-	NaPO	GM(N)	κρίνω
[343] 29:16	-	In	-		jPN	GM(J)	εἰμί

1 Job	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[344] 1:16	-	In	-	a	anP	GM(V)	λαλέω
[345] 1:17	-	In	-	a	anP	GM(V)	λαλέω

346 1:18a b	-	In	-	- p παρά	anP DNjkDNjP kPp	GM(J) GM(a)	λαλέω πίνω/ἐσθίω
347 2:9	-	In	d	-	NdJP	GM(V)	προβαίνω
348 6:17		Med	-		NP	TGM(øV)	γίνομαι
349 8:15	(Gen)	In	d	-	Pdn	GM(øV)	ἐπιλαμβάνω
350 14:21	-	In	d	-	jdPDNj	GM(øV)	γίνομαι
351 23:9	-	In	-	a	aPn	GkM(øV)	ποιέω
352 27:3	-	Med	εἰ μήν	a	aDNjP (+NdJjD◊p)	cGM(øV)	ἔνειμι
353 27:9	-	In	η	-	ηPiN	GM(øV)	ἐπέρχομαι
354 27:10	-	In	ηΩ	-	ηΩPn	GM(V)	ἐπικαλέω
355 31:31	-	Med	-		anjP	¢(GM)¢M	εἰμί
356 32:11	Nom	Med	- d		nP	MGT	ἀκούω
357 34:20	-	Fin	-	-	PN	M(V)G	ἐκκλίνω
358 34:37	-	Fin	-	-	ΩPOp	M(N)G	λαλέω
359 39:25	-	In	d	-	NdP	GM(V)	σημαίνω
360 41:17	-	In	-	-	Pdn	GM(N)	στρέφω
361 42:10	-	In	-	p περί	Pdnkp	GM(V)	εὐχομαι

1 Wisdom	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
362 2:3		Med	-		RP	CGM(V)	σβέννυμι
365 5:11	-	In	-		RP	cGM(V)	διαβαίνω
364 5:11a b	-	In Med	η	-	ηΩNPO PN	GM(øV) GMkM	διαπέτομαι
365 5:12	-	In	η	p ἐπί	ηΩNPp	GM(P)	βάλλω
366 14:6	-	Med	-		PJN	kgaGM(N)	ἀπόλλυμι
367 18:5	-	Med	k	-	kJPNkP	MkGM(p)	ἐκτίθημι σώζω
368 18:9 BS	-	Fin	-	a -	NaPO	MG	προαναμέλπω
369 18:14a b	-	In	g k	p ἐν	JgNPO kNpPO	GkGM(N)	περιέχω μεσάζω

1 Ecclus	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
370 Pro.1	-	In	-	p διά	NkNipkpk pP	GRkcM(N)	δίδωμι
371 4:6	Acc Gen	In	g	p ἐν	PgOpn	GM(N)	καταράομαι
372 13:9	-	In	-		PON	GM(P)	προσκαλέω
373 13:22	-	In	- d		NP	GM(J)	σφάλλω

1 Esther	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[374] 3:13c	-	In	d	-	PdniI	GM(P)	πυνθάνομαι
[375] 8:8	Gen	Med	-	-	DNP	MGM	ἐπιτάσσω

1 Judith	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[376] 4:7	-	Med	-	-	jDNP	MGM(V)	εἰμί

1 Tobit	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[377] 1:4	Nom	Med	-	-	jnP	TGM(N)	εἰμί
[378] 2:10	Gen	In	k	-	kDNjP	GM(V)	ἀνοίγω
[379] 4:6	Gen	Med	-		PnO	CGM(N)	ποιέω
[380] 14:11 B	Gen	In	k		kOnP	GM(V)	λέγω

1 Hosea	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[381] 3:4a	-	Fin	-	-	øPN	MG	εἰμί
b					øPN		εἰμί
c					øPN		εἰμί
d					øPNøNøN		εἰμί

1 Micah	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[382] 2:11	-	Fin	-		nP	MG	διώκω

1 Jonah	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[383] 4:2	-	Fin	-	a	aPnp	MG	εἰμί

1 Isaiah	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[384] 13:10	-	Med	-	-	DNP	M(V)Gk M(N)	ἀνατέλλω ἥλιος
[385] 58:9	Gen	Med	-	a -	aPn	MGM(V)S	λαλέω
[386] 65:24	Acc Gen	Med	-	a -	aPn	MGM(V)S	λαλέω

1 Jeremiah	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[387] 8:18	-	Fin	-	-	NjP	kM(V)G	ἀπορέω
[388] 35:9 (28:9)	-	Med	-	-	PDN	MGM(V)	ἔρχομαι
[389] 36:2 (29:2)	Gen	Med	-	p ἐκ a	aPNjkDNk DN kjNkNkN	MGM(p)	ἐξέρχομαι
[390] 43:23 (36:23)	-	In	k	-	kEPNOj	kEGM(V)	ἀναγινώσκω
[391] 48:7 (41:7)	Acc	In	k	p εἰς	kEPnp	kEGM(V)	εἰσέρχομαι
[392] 49:18 (42:9)	Acc	Fin	-	p εἰς	Pnp	ScMG	εἰσέρχομαι
[393] 52:1	-	In	-		PjNjT	GkM(a)	εἰμί

cf. 38:32; 43:3; 48:4 for participial Genitives after a time-reference.

1 Lamentations	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[394] 4:17	Gen	In	-	a -	aPn	GM(V)	εἰμί

1 Letter of Jer.	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[395] 6:16	Nom	Fin	-	p ἐν	Pnp	cMG	καθιδρύω
[396] 6:40a b	- Acc	In Med	d Ω	a -	adkjDNPO ΩjPnF	GRTM GkM(øV)	ἀτιμάζω εἰμί

1 Ezekiel	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[397] 15:5	Nom	In	-	a -	øanPj	GM(øV)	εἰμί

1 Daniel	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[398] 3:25 Not Θ	-	Fin	-	a - p ὑπο	PDNpa	M(P)G	ὑποκαίω
[399] 4:19a Not Θ b	Acc	Med	-		NPO kPDNj	kPGM(P)	λαμβάνω ἀλλοιόω
[400] 4:31 Θ + MSS	-	In	k	a p ἐν	aDNpP	GkM(a)	εἰμί
[401] 8:2a Not Θ b	Nom Nom	Med Fin	-	p ἐν p πρός	nPp aPnp	kM(V)GR kM(V)G	εἰμί
[402] 8:18 Not Θ	(Nom)	In	k	p μετά	kPnp	GM(V)	λαλέω

[403] 8:23 Also Θ	-	Med	-	-	PDNj	aGM(V)	πληρόω
[404] 9:21 Also Θ	Nom Dt Gn	In	k	a p ἐν	kaPnp	GkϑM(N)	λαλέω

1 Susanna	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[405] 44 Θ	-	Fin In	- k	-	nPF kPnF	ϑM(N)GM kGM(V)	ἐξάγω ἀπάγω
[406] 53 Θ	-	Fin Fin	-	-	DNPS PDNS	MG MG	λέγω λέγω

1 Bel	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[407] 14	-	Fin	-		njP	MG	οἶδα

1 I Macc	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[408] 4:19	-	In	-	a -	aPNO	GM(V)	πληρόω
[409] 5:67	(Nom) Acc	Fin	-	p ἐν	PnFp	M(a)G	βούλομαι
[410] 6:55	Nom	Med	-	a -	aPn	MRGM	ζάω

1 II Macc	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[411] 1:7	-	In	-		PN	GaM(n)	βασιλεύω
[412] 1:13	-	Fin	-	-	iPDpN	M(P)G	χράομαι
[413] 1:15a b	Nom	In In	k k	- pp	kPODNj knPpp	kGkGM(P)	προτίθημι προσέρχομαι
[414] 1:20	-	In	d	-	PdNJ	GTM(P)	διέρχομαι
[415] 1:23a b	- Nom	Med Fin	-	-	PDN PNDtNPΩ	M(N)G MGtG	δαπανάω κατάρχω
[416] 2:4	-	Med	-		NPi	M(V)GM	γίνομαι
[417] 2:22		Med	-	p μετά	DNpjPi	MGM	γίνομαι
[418] 3:1a b	-	In	- k	p μετά ap διά	DJNPp kDNaPp	GkGM(V)	κατοικέω συντηρέω
[419] 3:10	-	In	d	-	DdNPI	GIItIM	ὑποδείκνυμι
[420] 3:24	-	In	d	ap σύν ap κατά	adnppaP	GM(N)	πάρειμι
[421] 3:30	-	Med	-		DJPN	M(n)GM	ἐπιφαίνω
[422] 3:33	-	In	d	-	PdDNO	GM(N)	ποιέω
[423] 3:37	-	In	d	-	DdNPOQ	GM(V)	ἐπερωτάω
[424] 4:3	-	In	d	a	DdNaP©	GM(P)	λαλέω

425	4:7a	-	In	d	-	PdON	GkGM(V)	μεταλλάσσω
	b			k	-	kPONj		παραλαμβάνω
426	4:10	-	In	d	-	PdDN	GkPM(a)	ἐπινεύω
427	4:18a	-	In	d	p ἐν	PdJNp	GkGM(V)	ἄγω
	b			k		kDNP		πάρειμι
428	4:21	-	In	d	p εἰς	PdpNjp	GM(P)	ἀποστέλλω
					p διά			
429	4:28	-	Med	d	-	PdONj	MG(M)M	ποιέω
430	4:30	-	In	d		ndP	GM(V)	συνίστημι
431	4:36a	-	In	d	p ἀπό	DdNPp	GM(V)	ἐπανέρχομαι
	b		Med			PkDN	Gp	-μισοπονηρέω
432	4:38	-	Fin	-	-	DNϱOP	MG	ἀποδίδωμι
433	4:39a	-	In	d	ppp	PdJNppp	GkGM(V)	γίνομαι
	b				a	kPaDN		διαδίδωμι
434	4:40a	-	In	-		PdDN	GkGM(P)	ἐπεγείρω
	b		In			kiP		διεμπίμπλημι
	c		Fin			PjN◊AødA	G	προηγέομαι
435	4:44	Gen	In	d	p εἰς	PdDNp	GM(p)	καταντάω
436	5:5a	-	In	d	-	PdJN	G	γίνομαι
	b		In	-		ΩPNO	ΩGM(P)	μεταλλάσσω
	c		In	d		DdpP	G	συνελαύνω
	d		In	k	aa	aaPDN	kGM(N)	καταλαμβάνω
437	5:11	-	In	d	p περί	Pdip	GM(V)	προσπίπτω
438	6:7	-	In	d	-	PdjN	GM(V)	γίνομαι
439	6:8	-	Med	-	-	NP	MGI	ὑποτίθημι
440	6:29	-	Fin	-	p περί	nPpOOp	M(P)G	ἄγω
					p διά			
441	7:4a	-	In	d	a	DdaP	GMG	ἐκπυρόω
	b		Fin			DJNkDNP		συνοράω
442	7:5	-	In	d	-	DdNaPj	GM(p)	δίδωμι
443	7:7	-	In	d	a -	PdDNa	GM(N)	μεταλλάσσω
444	7:13	-	In	kd		kndP	GM(J)	μεταλλάσσω
445	7:24	-	Med	-	a -	aDNP	M(N)GM	περίειμι
				k	-			
446	7:25	-	In	d	-	DdNøP	GM(P)	προσέχω
447	7:26	-	In	d	a -	adnP	GM(V)	παραινέω
448	7:30	-	In	d	a	adnP	GM(N)	καταλήγω
449	8:5	-	Fin	-	p εἰς	DNjpP	PMG	τρέπω
450	8:12	Dat	Med	k		kPiO	MkGM(N)	μεταδίδωμι
451	8:20	Dat	Med	-	-	DNp	M(P)IGM	ἀπορέω
452	8:24	-	In	d	-	PdiDNj	GM(V)	γίνομαι
453	9:2	Nom	In	δ	δή	DNP	ddηM(p)	ὁρμάω
454	9:5	Acc	In	d	a	adnPO	GM(V)	καταλήγω
455	9:18	-	In	d	-	ødPDN	GM(V)	λήγω
456	10:1	-	Med	-	-	DNPO	M(N)GM	προάγω
				-				

[457] 10:18	-	In	d	p εἰς a	PdaNp	GkM(j)	συμφεύγω
[458] 10:25	-	Med	-	-	Pn	M(N)GM	συνεγγίζω
[459] 10:28	-	In	d	a	adDNP	GM(V)	διαχέω
[460] 10:29	-	In	d	-	PdJN	M(P)G	ἄγω
[461] 10:32	-	Fin	-	a	PaN	M(n)G	στρατηγέω
[462] 10:35	-	In	d		PdDJN	GM(J)	ὑποφαίνω
[463] 11:8	Gen	In	d	a - p πρός	adpP	GM(V)	εἰμί
[464] 11:10	-	Fin	-		PODN	M(V)G	ἐλεέω
[465] 11:13	-	Med	-		DJNPi	PGPM(V)	συμμαχέω
[466] 11:23a	-	In	-	p εἰς	DNjpP	G	μεθίστημι
MS A b	Nom	Med		p πρός	PIp	GM(P)	βούλομαι
[467] 12:1	-	In	d	-	PdDNJ	GM(N)	γίνομαι
[468] 12:3	-	Fin?	d	p πρός	ΩøPpN	M(N)G	ἐνίστημι
[469] 12:4	Acc	Med?	k	-	knP	kGGkG	ἐπιδέχομαι
	Acc	Med	-		ΩFP	M(P)	θέλω
	Acc	Med	k		køjP		ἔχω
[470] 12:7	-	In	d	-	DdNP	GM(V)	συγκλείω
[471] 12:9	-	Fin	-	-	NPj	M(P)G	εἰμί
[472] 12:10	Nom (Dat)	Med	-	p ἐπί	POP	PGM(V)	ποιέω
[473] 12:11a	-	In	d	-	PdJN	GkGM(P)	γίνομαι
b		In		p διά	kDpP		εὐημερέω
[474] 12:22a	-	In	d	-	PdDjNJ	GkGM(p)	ἐπιφαινω
b		In	k	pp	kPNpNtp		γίνομαι
[475] 12:25	Acc	In	d	a	PdnaOF	GM(V)	πιστόω
[476] 12:30	-	In	-	-	PdD◊NRO	G	ἀπομαρτυρέω
				-	kO		
[477] 12:31	-	Fin	-	-	DjNPj	M(P)G	εἰμί
[478] 12:35a	Nom	Med	k	-	kPF	M(N)kG	βούλομαι
b	-	Med	-		jnPi	G	ἐπιφέρω
c	-	Med	-		kOP	kGM(V)	καθαιρέω
[479] 12:36a	-	In	d	a	DdaP	GkGM(p)	μάχομαι
b	-	In	k		kjP		εἰμί
[480] 12:38	-	In	d	-	DdNP	GM(p)	ἐπιβάλλω
[481] 13:4	-	Med	k	-	kNPF	MkGM(V)	ὑποδείκνυμι
[482] 13:12a	Acc	In	d	a -	JdOPa	GkGM(P)	ποιέω
b		Med		ppa	kPOppa		καταξιόω
[483] 13:17	-	In	d	a -	PdaDN	GM(n)	ὑποφαίνω
[484] 14:11	-	In	d	p ὑπό	ndPp	GM(a)	λέγω
[485] 14:16	-	In	d		PdDN	GM(a)	προστάσσω
	-						
[486] 14:20a	-	In	d	p περί	JdPpN	G	γίνομαι
b	-	In	-		DNiP	kG	ἀνακοινόω
c		In			kPJN	kGM(V)	φαίνω
[487] 14:28	-	In	d	-	Pdni	GM(V)	προσπίπτω

488	14:31	-	Med	-	-	DNOP	PPGM(V)	προσάγω
489	14:41a	-	In	d	-	DdNPF	G	μέλλω
	b	-		-		kOP	kG	βιάζω
	c					kPFkF	kGM(J)	κελεύω
490	14:43	-	Med	k		NDpP	PkGM(P)	εἰσβάλλω
491	14:44a	-	In	d	a	DdaP	GGM(V)	ἀναποδίζω
	b	-	Med	k		PN		γίνομαι
492	15:2	-	In	d		Dd◊NPS	GS	λέγω
493	15:4	-	In	d	-	DdP	GS	ἀπόφημι
494	15:20a	-	In	k	a -	kJaPO	G	προσδοκάω
	b	-	Med	k		kaPDN	kG	προσμίσγω
	c	-	Med	k		kDNP	kG	ἐκτάσσω
	d	-	Med	k	p ἐπί	kDNpP	kG	ἐπικαθίστημι
	e		Med	d	p κατά	DdNpP	GM(P)	τάσσω
495	14:29	-	In	d	-	PdNkN	GM(V)	γίνομαι
496	14:37a	-	In	o	a	Do◊Pa	G	χωρέω
	b			k	pp	kpPDNp	kGM(k)	κρατέω

1 III	Macc	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
497	1:4a	-	In	d		PdJN	GkGM(a)	γίνομαι
	b	-	In	k	a	kDNaPi		ῥώννυμι
498	1:8	Acc	In	d	p πρὸς	DdNPppO	GM(V)	διαπέμπω
					p ἀπὸ	k◊k◊		
499	1:11	-	In	d	-	DdPøFFp	GdM(D)	λέγω
500	1:12	-	In	t	-	DtNP	GM(øΩ)	παρανα
								γινώσκω
501	1:15a	-	In	d	-	PdΦn	GM(p)G	γίνομαι
	b		Fin	k		kPnkø		θέλω
502	1:16a	-	In	d	p ἐν	DdNpP	G	προσπίπτω
	b		In	k		kPOFkF	kG	δέομαι
	c		In	t	p μετὰ	NtpOP	GtM(D)	ἐμπίμπλημι
503	2:12	Dat	Med	k		kPDN	TGdM(∂)	θλίβω
504	3:2a	-	In	d		ndP	GM(N)	οἰκονομέω
	b		Fin	(d)	p εἰς	N(d)Pp	dG	δίδωμι
	c		Fin	-	p ἀπὸ	ΩpOP	G	κωλύω
505	3:14	-	In	-	a	Dp◊NRapp	GM(V)	ἄγω
					pp	P		
506	3:17	Acc	Med	-	-	PnFkF	PGPM(V)	προθυμέομαι
507	3:24	-	Med	-	a	JaNP	PkPGM(V)	ἐνίστημι
508	3:26	-	In	g	a	ngaP	GM(V)	κολάζω
509	4:11a	Acc	In	d	p ἐπὶ	ndpP	GkGcM(V)	ἄγω
	b		In	k	-	kDNPc		περαίνω
510	4:18a	Gen	Med	kr	ap	krPapDJ	MG	εἰμί
	b	Gen	Med	md	app	DmpaPDd	G	συνίστημι
						kp		
	c		Fin	Ω		ΩjPi	G	καθίστημι

511	4:19	Acc	In	d	a	PdiaΩ	GM(V)	ἀπειλέω
512	4:20	Acc	Fin	-	p μετὰ	PpI	G	λέγω
513	5:14	-	In	d	aa	PdaJNa	GM(P)	μεσόω
514	5:17	-	In	k		RkP	GM(V)	γίνομαι
515	5:18	-	In	d	ad	adPDN	GM(N)	προσβαίνω
516	5:19a	-	In	d	-	DdPI	GkGM(P)	ὑποδείκνυμι
	b		In	k		kDNi(?)P		προσμαρτυρέω
517	5:21	-	In	d		PdDN	GM(a)	λέγω
518	5:26	Gen	Med	k	-	kDNOP	TGM(N)	ἐκδέχομαι
519	5:27	Nom	In	d	p ἐπὶ	DdPkPp	GM(p)	ἀποδέχομαι
			-	-	-			καταπλήσσω
520	5:46	-	Med	-	-	DNaipP	MPpGM(P)	καταμεστόω
521	6:15	-	Med	-	-	pnP	cSøGM	εἰμί
522	6:16	-	In	d	-	DdNPaO	GM(N)	λήγω
523	7:2	-	Med	-	-	PiDJNOc	M(V)G	κατευθύνω
524	7:8a	-	Fin	-	pa	pøOaP	M(V)G	καταβλάπτω
	b		Fin		pp	øPpp	øG	ὀνειδίζω
525	7:18	-	Fin	-	a	DNPiaOipp	PRM(a)G	χορηγέω
					pp			

1 IV	Macc	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
526	3:8	-	Med	τότε δὴ	-	PN	TGM(P)	γίνομαι
527	3:12	-	In	ὅθεν	p ἐπὶ	DNpP	GM(J)	σχετλιάζω
528	4:7a	Nom	In	k	a	kDNpP	GGtM(I)	σχετλιάζω
	b				p πρὸς	Pt		ἀντιλέγω
529	4:9	-	In	d	pp	DdNppPOF	G	ἱκετεύω
					-			
530	4:10		In	t	pp	PtpDNp	GtM(a)	ἄνειμι
531	4:15	-	In	d		PdNDj	GM(V)	τελευτάω
532	4:22	-	Med	-	p περὶ	NPp	TIGM(a)	διαδίδωμι
533	5:1	-	Med	k	a	kDN(i)Paj	PkGM(V)	παρίστημι
534	5:4	-	In	d	-	JdP	GM(J)	συναρπάζω
535	6:33	Dat	In	d	a	adDNOP	GM(n)	νικάω
536	7:13a	-	Med	-	a	PaDjN	G	λύω
	b		Med	kd		kPdDN	kG	περιχαλάω
	c		Med	dk		PdkDN	GdM(V)	κάμινω
537	8:3	-	In	-	-	OPDN	GM(V)	διατάσσω
538	9:10	-	In	-	-	OnP	GM(ø)	λέγω
539	9:16	-	In	k	-	kDNPS	GM(D)	λέγω
540	9:26		In	d	-	PdJO	GM(V)	θαυμάζω
541	10:1	-	In	k	-	knOP	GM(D)	καρτερέω
542	11:13	-	In	d	-	Pdkn	GM(D)	τελευτάω
543	12:7	-	Med	d	p	DNaPO	DdGM(Ω)S	παρίστημι

[544] 13:23	-	Med	οὕτως τοίνυν	-	P(J)DN	GM(D)	καθίστημι
[545] 13:27	-	In	ὁμοίως α kr	-	krDNkDN kDjNOP	GM(V)	συναύξω
[546] 15:11	-	In	α ὅμως kr	-	krjPDppΦO	GM(p)	εἰμί
[547] 18:9	-	In	d	-	ndjP	GM(V)	γίνομαι

1 Pss Sol	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[548] 8:12	-	Fin	Ω	-	ΩøPNj	MG	εἰμί
[549] 8:36	-	Fin	Ω	-	ΩøPj	MG	εἰμί

1 Odes	2 Case	3 Position	4 Particle	5 Adjunct	6 Order	7 Order	8 Vocabulary
[550] 7:12	-	Fin	-	-	NPF	MG	ἐγγίζω

C. Variations in the use of the Genitive Absolute in Matthew according to variations in manuscripts and in the Early Fathers.

2 13:21 Two codices read ειτα (one having also δε).
Evidence from Versions for και instead of η; and for the omission of του διωγμου.

– 14:6 For Dative Absolute some read γενεσιων δε γενομενων or γενεσιων (αυτων) δε αγομενων.

3 14:15 Versions read et = k N P.

4 14:23 Versions read et = k N P.

14 8:28 Plural used for Singular. Addition of δε.
Dative Participle and Dative Absolute instead of Genitive.

8:29 ιδου omitted. See 13:3.

15 9:10 kEnPp changed to kP(n).
From και ιδου some omit και, some omit ιδου.

16 9:18 Some replace O n P with O d n P.
Some replace αυτοις with τοις οχλοις, some omit both.
Some replace λαλεω with λεγω.
Addition of et to ecce.

17 12:46 Strong support for a d n P i. Some support for P d n i.
Origen P n i. Minuscule adds και to ιδου.

18 13:6 Some omit δε; 1 Codex has D d N P for N d P.

19 13:19 Some add ανθρωπου to παντος. Some have συνιοντος for συνιεντος.

20	14:32	Evidence for εμβαντων instead of αναβαντων. One minuscule and some Versions support Dative Absolute IN SINGULAR.
29	11:7	One MS has αυτων for τουτων.
	9:28	Some replace Dative Absolute with Genitive Absolute. Some omit δε. Compound Verb appears.
30	8:5	Dative Absolute used instead of Genitive. τω Ιησου replaces αυτω.
	8:23	Genitive Absolute used instead of Dative. τω Ιησου replaces αυτω.
32	1:18	Addition of γάρ.
33	1:20	Participle to Present tense. Omission of ιδού (e.g. Augustine Irenaeus).
34	2:1	Omission of δέ; addition of Χριστου, of et to ecce (= ιδου). Justin Dial 78:1 extends uses of Genitive Absolute, and omits ιδου. Protoevangelium Jacobi omits all Genitive Absolutes but retains the use of ιδου.
35	2:13	Alteration of order to n d P, to P d D N, to P d n p, ιδου omitted in part of the Syriac tradition.
36	2:19	ιδου omitted in part of the Syriac tradition.
	3:16	Ablative Absolute appears in Latin translations; cf. 9:8.
39	8:1	Replacement of δε with και. Dative Absolute used instead of Genitive.
40	9:32	διερχομαι used for εξερχομαι. Some have P d n instead of n d P. Some omit ιδου.
43	17:26	Justin Dial 101.2 and Apol 16,7 extend the use of the Genitive Participle without Noun or Pronoun to Mt 19:16. Some scholars argue for Matthean influence in Justin's development of the construction. Köhler suggests that the language used is too general for such a judgment to be made.

Discussion of the three analyses of the Genitive Absolute in the Gospels

1. It is possible to discuss the synoptic uses of this construction, Gospel by Gospel, according to significant groupings and taking account of the classifications Mt Par Mk, Mt Diff Mk etc.

(a) Matthew

The following significant groupings are common to all the Matthean classifications:

(i) k P n p

MT	PAR MK	5, 6
	DIFF MK	14, 20, 24, 25
	NO PAR	37.

According to older redaction-critical methods the above findings would be evidence for Matthean redactional activity. However, the following evidence should also be noted:

MK	DIFF MT	68, 70, 71
	>*	75, 78, 79
	>	84
LK	>*MT	115
	NO PAR	130
LXX		264, 305, 409

Of the above examples Item 6 uses the Genitive Absolute with reference to a singular Pronoun in the Dative case, where the Marcan parallel lacks the Dative Pronoun (see 58). A similar use of the Genitive Absolute with reference to a Dative Pronoun or Noun is found in 14, 25 and 37. The prepositional adjunct εἰς is found in four of these examples (all Mt Diff Mk).

Evidence of relevant parallels to this would be:

MK	PAR MT	57, 63
	DIFF MT	71
	>*	75
LK	DIFF MK	105
	>*	114
LK	NO PAR	120, 121, 124, 125, 126
ACTS		114, 164, 169, 184
LXX		231, 241, 256, 259, 261, 269, 288, 316, 328, 411, 457, 458, 510, 542

A hypothesis might be that 57 and 63 gave expression to a pattern to which other uses were approximated in the course of transmission.

(ii) P d n p or P d N p

Examples of this pattern occur in several classifications, and they also exhibit features recurring erratically across the classifications and across the groupings.

MT	PAR MK	2, 7 (NB P /d/ n p)
	DIFF MK	23

	DIFF LK	30 (NB P /d/n/ p)
	NO PAR	39, 42, 50
LK	NO PAR	131 (P d n ap)
ACTS		144, 189, 201
LXX		246, 442

The use of the particle Pdn(N)** is paralleled in several classifications:

MT	PAR MK	11
	DIFF MK	26
	NO PAR	35, 36, 44, 45, 47, 48, 51
LK	PAR MK	87 (P d/D/N)
LK	DIFF MK	92, 93, 94, 95, 99, 100, 101, (99–101 P /d/ n*) 103
	PAR MT	109 (However Lk = PdDNj; Mt = /n/ d P)
	DIFF MT	(For /d/ see 111 N /d/ P, 112 E /d/ DNP)
	>*MT	116
	NO PAR	120, 128, 133
ACTS		141, 142, 151, 153, 154, 157, 160, 161, 162, 164, 165, 166, 167, 172, 174, 175, 177, 188, 191, 192, 196, 197, 198, 203, 218, 219, 224, 228, 229
LXX		235, 239, 322, 330, 335, 336, 343, 354, 365, 366, 379, 421, 429, 433, 434, 440, 441, 443, 445, 450, 467, 469, 474, 480, 481, 482, 483, 492, 494, 502, 504, 508, 524, 538

The Genitive in the above examples has reference to various cases in the main sentence: to the

NOMINATIVE	94, (128), 191, 198, 235, 246, 322
GENITIVE	11, (160), 224, (354), 442
ACCUSATIVE	26 (MT Diff Mk), 50, 99, 100, 142, 151, 172, 177, 189, 203, 228, 239, 482
DATIVE	7 (MT Diff Mk), 23, 30 (MT Diff Lk), 39, 44, 120, 144, 164

Variations of this basic pattern appear:

(A) PdnF

MT	NO PAR	44, 45
LK	NO PAR	133
ACTS		153

(B) Pdn∂ M(N) or PdDN∂ M(N)

MT	NO PAR	35, 36, 51

Note however from the above lists that, of the Pdn(N)* uses in Matthew, ∂ is missing in 11, 26, 44, 45, 47, 48.

The examples of the Pdnp group recurring erratically across the classifications and groupings with variations do not easily permit the description of Matthean items as redactional. For example, attempts to

claim 23 and 26 as redactional on the grounds of syntactic usage are unreliable.

Of these, Pdn∂ has often been regarded as a Matthean redactional form, and therefore requires particularly careful attention. Two points are relevant at this stage (there will be further discussion of the uses in Matthew chs. 1–2 below):

(a) Not only the presence of ∂ in 35, 36, 51 needs explanation, but also its absence in the six other examples quoted. As was indicated in the previous chapter, negative evidence is important. Without an explanation of the material which does not fit with the thesis of a particularly Matthean redactional construction, the case for that particular construction is incomplete and unproven.

(b) There are parallel examples of the use of ∂:

MT PAR MK	12
	(∂ Diff Mk, but see also 90 and p.295 n.47)
MT DIFF MK	15, 16, 17, 21
	(On 15, see the LXX examples of k∂ below)
	(On 16, see ∂ in Lk 8:41)
	(On 16, 17, 21, see the discussion of the anP*∂ group below)
MT NO PAR	33, 34, 35, 36, 40, 51
	(On 33, 34, 35, 36, see the notes on pp.512 and 517f; on 40, see 16)
LK DIFF MK	105
ACTS	140 (note the Sentence Order TG k ∂M(N))
LXX	233, 279, 286, 293, 294, 295, 306, 307, 308, 310, 316, 411, 412, 510 (all k∂ except 412 and 510)

(iii) a n P /i/

MT PAR MK	12
MT DIFF MK	16 (O n p i), 17, 21 (all with ∂; for 17 see the notes on p.511)
MK PAR MT	64
MK > MT	85
LK PAR MK	88, 90, 97 (a/d/Pn)
LK NO PAR	135, 136 (see also 127, 129, 135, 136, 137)
ACTS	159 (aPDNO), 194 (OdnP)
LXX	233(k∂), 234(k), 274, 275(k), 291(k), 294(k∂), 295(k∂), 298(k), 307(k∂), 333, 349, 351, 380, 404, 454(adnP), 455(adnP) (see also 466, 522)

The spread of this particular group across various LXX translators, and the variant orders of the elements within the Genitive Absolute, suggest that this is a formalized narrative introductory pattern used with freedom in some writings, with a tendency in the Matthean material toward a stock form. Mt 17:5 is a crucial example and much depends on how the agreement between Matthew and Luke against Mark is evaluated. To regard all the agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark in the Transfiguration Narrative as made independently is perhaps less likely than to assume, with the support of the above information, that the synoptic tradition was in a process of development in which stock patterns had a (perhaps increasingly significant) place.

(iv) N d P G M(V or N)

MT	PAR MK	1, 3, 13 (for 3 see the textual evidence in the notes on p.511)
MT	DIFF MK	18, 28
MT	NO PAR	46
MK	>	83
LK	DIFF MT	111
ACTS		170, 202
LXX		(See 352)

The formula is not common to the LXX which uses PDN (257, 281, 289, 297, 300, 306, 315, 319, 321, 322, 323, 330, 394, 395, 405, 406, 413, 419, 422). The synoptic evidence might suggest a formalization of the time-expression in 1, 3 and 13. This would perhaps provide an explanation more coherent with the total picture of synoptic uses of the Genitive Absolute now emerging than theories of Matthean Priority can provide. The uses of NdP G M(V) might be claimed as redactional. But 28 would be difficult to explain on that assumption, and indeed on the additional assumption of Matthean Priority.

(v) The use of the Dative for the Genitive Absolute

In three textually certain cases the Dative is used where the above patterns, understood from a strictly redactional point of view, would have led us to expect Genitive Absolutes.

MT	DIFF MK	-	MK 8:22f / Mt 9:27–28 (see 6, 58 and the notes on these)
		-	Mk 11:27 / Mt 21:23 (see 70)
MK	DIFF MT	66–67	Mk 6:21–22 / Mt 14:6

Of these, Mt 9:27–28 is particularly interesting because its peculiarities of vocabulary and syntax have raised questions concerning its source. They led Albert Fuchs, for example, to classify the passage as including evidence for Deutero–Mark. Although this may not be the most likely hypothesis, the use of the Dative Absolute in 9:27 and 14:6 does, if Mark is prior, raise the issue of non-literary stages between Mark and Matthew. It is of course possible to argue that 9:27 and 14:6 are evidence for a literary preference on Matthew's part, but his reticence in using the Dative Absolute elsewhere contradicts this.

These five patterns illustrate a basic feature of the Matthean usage of the Genitive Absolute. There are traditional patterns in Matthew's Gospel which are not easily reducible to redactional choices based on a coherent literary style and which might be more easily explained by reference to developments within the tradition.

The LXX examples are particularly helpful here. If II Maccabees is taken as an illustration of how a writer has used the Genitive Absolute, then one possible overall picture is of occasional narrative formulae (454-455) with substantial variety in the appropriation of other patterns. Matthew does not belong to that kind of literary usage. All the patterns in Matthew are used with strictly limited variations.

We turn next to a series of unusual usages in Matthew.

Unusual Matthean uses: 32, 33, 34, 35, 43 and 15

Even where distinctive elements within Matthew's usage do appear, the larger canvas against which those elements can now be assessed suggests possibilities other than that of redactional literary activity. We saw this in the case of the examples of ἰδοὺ + the Genitive Absolute. Another example is 32 (Mt 1:18), where the Genitive of the Genitive Absolute refers to the subject of the main sentence. Some scholars argue on various grounds, structural, linguistic and theological, that Matthew himself constructed this verse and that this particular feature of 1:18, a Genitive Absolute with reference to the subject of the main sentence, is likely to be redactional. However, 67, 69 are evidence to the contrary, and the supposedly unusual character of Mt 1:18 is lessened by the parallels in the Synoptics (118, 128), in Acts (145, 191, 198, 212, 220, 225), in the LXX (235, 238, 240, 241, 242, 246, 247, 248, 249, 254, 255, 260, 265, 268, 269, 277, 278, 288, 304, 309, 310, 317, 322, 329, 337, 361, 383, 402, 404, 408, 411, 416, 417, 420, 422, 460, 473, 479, 485, 526, 535) and in the Papyri. If Matthew constructed 1:18, it is hard to understand why he used a construction well attested elsewhere which he otherwise avoided, or at least

did not prefer; or, to state the matter in an alternative way, it is hard to see any evidence on linguistic grounds for suggesting that the construction should be treated as redactional.

The issues raised by the Genitive Absolute at 2:1 help to clarify the question of redactional judgments. The use in 2:1 is usually assumed to be Matthean because of the recurring GəM(N) pattern. However, ἰδοὺ + the Genitive Absolute cannot be considered apart from the 'Dream' form within which ἰδοὺ has various appearances (cf. Gen 20:3-8; 28:12-16; 31:10-13; 46:2-4; Num 22:8-13; 22:20-21 and I Kgs 3:5-15). This 'Dream' form has been noted by several scholars, but they are divided regarding the source of the form and number of the Matthean sections. Recently Gnuse has suggested a fivefold pattern, with a Genitive Absolute accompanying the full dream reports and a Participle accompanying the dream references (1:20; 2:12; 2:13; 2:19; 2:22), with substantial Matthean editing responsible for the dream format, on the basis of the dreams from the Book of Genesis. Three considerations cast doubt on this theory. First, it does not however explain the three examples of GəM(N), which in the LXX belongs (with of course the και ie GkəM(N)) to 'Meeting' or 'Epiphany' forms rather than 'Dream' forms (see also the Matthean appearances of GəM in 40 and 51, the Lucan parallel in 9:32 to 21, also 90 and 140). Second, as far as concerns previous sources in Matthew 1-2 there can be little doubt of this: the unparalleled usages in chs. 1-2 are out of proportion with the unparalleled usages in the following chapters. The question is the level of editing of those sources. As the 1 Esdras parallels in 323-325 and 327-329 suggest, it would only need a single example from the source to generate a sequence of uses. In those circumstances, to speak of redactional preference would be misleading. The most which could be claimed is a redactional shaping of a section on the basis of an initial syntactical pattern. The distribution of GəM is after all very uneven in Matthew's Gospel, so that the use of four examples in close proximity requires an explanation specific to the passage rather than general to the author. Third, the Genesis approach to dreams is not necessarily that to which Matthew or his sources subscribed. There is an interest in dreams in the Gospel of Matthew, as in 27:19, where ἰδοὺ is not used. On all three grounds Gnuse's argument for regarding the use of ἰδοὺ + Genitive Absolute in 1:20 as Matthean editing is unsatisfactory, and we remain dependent on stylistic and syntactical grounds for a final decision rather than on structural and theological. There is sufficient distinctiveness in the 1:20 usage for us to stay with the possibility that it was derived from a source. That construction may have propagated its further use in the collection of 'dream' stories either before or during the final redaction of the Gospel.

43 is another unusual MT NO PAR construction. It is unique in the Synoptists and only partially paralleled in the LXX (285, 313, 519). There are several other dialogues in Matthew where the construction used in 43 might have been repeated, but Mt 17:26 remains unique. Discussions regarding possible source material behind the Temple Tax pericope have sometimes asserted the presence there of source material, but regarded ειποντος δε as part of the redaction, whereas others have found it easier to assert a Semitic background for the pericope if ειποντος δε could be treated as a poor variant reading. ειποντος δε is however surely the harder reading; and with the recognition that oral tradition of the Gospel material need not have been confined to the Semitic languages, it becomes apparent that the presence of an unusual Greek construction is not, of itself, sufficient evidence for deriving it from redaction rather than from a source.

15 in its probable original textual form is without parallel in the Gospels. Beyer, *Semitische Syntax*, considers the variant textual possibilities, and concludes that the original reading is an inaccurate imitation of Semitic syntax. Lucan examples correspond to Hebraic syntax (112 LK DIFF MT), and the only parallel to 15 (apart from Mk 2:15 Minuscule 579, which is derivable from Mt 9:10) is the Western Text of Acts 13:43 (see 165). Since 15 is MT DIFF MK it would, by traditional methods of redaction criticism, be judged redactional. But there is evidence from 89, 91 and 102 that εγενετο can be linked with the Genitive Absolute in Marcan contexts where Matthew does not avail himself of that possibility (see also 112 LK DIFF MT). The redactional judgment at 15 is therefore insecure.

We have seen then that the five patterns in Matthew illustrate a basic feature of the Matthean usage of the Genitive Absolute. There are traditional patterns in Matthew's Gospel which are not easily reducible to redactional choices based on a coherent literary style and which might be more easily explained by reference to developments within the tradition. Further we have seen that none of the unusual uses need be classified as redactional. We may note also that the spread of vocabulary associated in Matthew with the Genitive Absolute serves as an additional warning against too easy an assumption of redactional activity here. In the category of MT PAR MK only three items of vocabulary are different between Matthew and Mark (3, 8); the distinctively Matthean items in category MT DIFF MK are few, and some of these have parallels with the vocabulary of the MK DIFF MT and MK >* categories. The relationship between the vocabulary of the Genitive Absolutes in Matthew and Mark is a further indication that the Matthean use of the construction has a traditional element.

The Marcan use of the Genitive Absolute indicates how difficult it would be to explain the development of the Marcan usage as a consequence of

Mark's use of Matthew. If Mark had been using Matthew he would have acted in two apparently contradictory ways: he would have reduced the overall range of Matthean uses (losing the unusual examples such as 15, 33-35, 43, 44-45, 48) but at the same time diversified the stock Matthean patterns (e.g. in the category MK PART MT 55, 56, 58, 61, 62, 64, 65). If Matthew had been using Mark, the problems would decrease. Matthew would then represent a stage later in the tradition when the Marcan patterns had become formalized and a wider range of syntactic source material needed to be conserved.

The Lucan usage shows a richer variety of syntax and structure than either Matthew or Mark, although by no means the variety and complexity to be found in the LXX. Again the evidence is more readily intelligible if Mark came first. There are eight formulaic uses which vary in their degree of correspondence to Mark (LK DIFF MK 92-95, 99-101, 103); there is the grouping mentioned above (LK PAR MK 89, LK DIFF MK 102, LK DIFF MT 112), which (at least according to Beyer) has an element of homogeneity (and could therefore have entered the Lucan tradition at the linking up of the Marcan and Q traditions); and there are small groups of constructions which cut across sections where Luke seems largely independent of Mark, as well as those where Luke seems largely dependent on Mark. This would suggest that the tradition received a slightly stronger stylistic adaptation in Luke's case than in Matthew's. The point should not be over-stated: Luke is using the tradition, as Matthew was, and working with a formalizing stage of the tradition. But Luke's pallet is richer.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The abbreviations used are the standard forms

1. *TEXTS AND REFERENCE WORKS*

Aland, K. *Die alten* **Übersetzungen** *des Neuen Testaments, die Kirchenväterzitate und Lektionare.* Berlin: De Gruyter, 1972.

Arndt, W. & Gingrich, F. *A Greek–English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature.* Cambridge: CUP, 1952[4].

Barthélemy, D., et al. **Discoveries** *in the Judaean Desert I–XII.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964-1994.

Beyer, K. *Die aramäischen* **Texten** *vom Toten Meer samt den Inschriften aus Palästina, dem Testament Levis aus der Kairoer Genisa, der Fastenrolle and den alten talmudischen Zitaten.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984.

Bihlmeyer, K., et al. *Die Apostolischen Väter.* Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1970[3].

Blass, F., Debrunner, A. & Funk, R.W. **Grammar** *of New Testament Greek.* Cambridge: CUP, 1961.

Böhlig, A., et al. *Nag Hammadi* **Codices** *III,2 & IV,2.* Leiden: Brill, 1975.

Braude, W.G. *The* **Midrash** *on Psalms.* Judaica Series, XIII. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959.

—— *Pesikta de-Rab* **Kahana**. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975.

—— *Pesikta* **Rabbat**. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968.

Braun, H. '**Qumran** and das Neue Testament. Ein Bericht über 10 Jahre Forschung (1950-1960).' *ThR* N.F. 28 (1962), pp.97-234.

Charlesworth, J. (ed.) *The* **Odes** *of Solomon. The Syriac Texts.* Missoula: Montana, 1983[2].

Charlesworth, R. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha.* Vols. 1 and 2. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1983.

Colson, F.H. (ed.) *Philo* (Loeb). London: Heinemann, 1968.

Danby, H. *The Mishnah.* London: Oxford University Press, 1967.

De Jonge, M. *The* **Testaments** *of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Critical Edition of the Greek Text.* Leiden: Brill, 1978.

Diez Macho, A. *Neophyti I. Targum Palestinense MS de la Bibliotheca Vaticana.* Madrid: C.S.I.C., 1978.

Doudna, J.C. *The Greek of the Gospel of* **Mark**. Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, 1961.

Dupont-Sommer, A. *The Essene Writings from* **Qumran** (trans. G. Vermes). Oxford: Blackwell, 1961.

Eisenman, R. & Wise, M. — *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered.* Shaftesbury: Element, 1992.

Epstein, I. — *Hebrew–English Edition of the Babylonian* **Talmud**. London: Soncino Press, 1965.

Etheridge, J. (ed.) — *The* **Targums** *of Onkelos and Jonathan ben Uzziel with the Fragments of the Jerusalem Targum.* New York: KTAV, 1968.

Fanning, B. — *Verbal* **Aspect** *in New Testament Greek.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.

Fieger, M. — *Das* **Thomas***evangelium. Einleitung, Kommentar und Systematik.* Münster: Aschendorff, 1991.

Field, F. — *Origenis Hexaplorum Quae Supersunt.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1875.

Finkelstein, L. — *Sifre on Deuteronomy.* New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1969.

Fitzmyer, J.A. (ed.) — *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1. A* **Commentary**. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966.

—— — *A Manual of Palestinian Aramaic Texts.* Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978.

Freedman, H. & Simon, H. — *Midrash Rabbah.* London: Soncino Press, 1961[3].

Gaston, L. — **Horae Synopticae** *Electronicae. Word Statistics of the Synoptic Gospels.* Montana: Scholars' Press, 1973.

Goldin, J. — *The Fathers according to* **Rabbi Nathan**. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954.

Goldschmidt, L. — *Subject* **Concordance to** *the Babylonian* **Talmud**. Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1959.

—— — *Der Babylonische Talmud.* Berlin: S. Calvary, 1897.

Grenfell, B. & Hunt, A. — **Fayum** *Towns and their Papyri.* London: Hogarth, 1900.

—— — *The* **Amherst** *Papyri.* 2 Vols. London: Hogarth, 1900-1901.

—— — **Oxyrhynchus** *Papyri.* Part X. Oxford: University Press, 1914.

Guillaumont, A., et al. — *The Gospel According to* **Thomas**. *Coptic Text Established and Translated.* Leiden: Brill, 1959.

—— — *The* **Facsimile Edition** *of Nag Hammadi Codices.* Leiden: Brill, 1974.

Hausrath, A. (ed.) — **Cor***pus* **Fab***ularum* **Aesop***icarum.* Lipsiae: Teubner, 1956.

Hawkins, J. — **Horae Synopticae**: *Contributions to the Study of the Synoptic Problem.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1919[2].

Henneke, E. — *New Testament* **Apocrypha** (trans. R.McL. Wilson). London: Lutterworth, 1965.

Herford, R.T. — *Pirke Aboth.* New York: Jewish Institute of Religion, 1925.

Holm-Nielsen, S. — *Hodayot. Psalms from Qumran.* Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget, 1960.

Horbury, W. & Noy, D. — *Jewish* **Inscriptions** *of Graeco-Roman Egypt.* Cambridge: CUP, 1992.

Horn, R.C. *The use of the Subjunctive and Optative Moods in the Non-Literary* ***Papyri***. Philadelphia, 1926.

Jastrow, M. *A Dictionary of the* **Targumim**, *the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*. London: Luzac, 1903.

Kittel, G. *Sifre zu Deuteronomium. Rabbinische Texte*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1922.

—— *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (trans. G.W. Bromiley (**TDNT**)). Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-1974.

Köhler, W.-D. *Die* **Rezeption** *des Matthäusevangeliums in der Zeit vor Irenäus*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1987.

Knibbs, M.A. *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.

Köster, H. *Synoptische* **Überlieferung** *bei den Apostolischen Vätern*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1957.

Kuhn, K.G. *Der tannaitische Midrasch* **Sifre zu Numeri**. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1959.

—— **Konkordanz** *zu den Qumrantexten*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960.

—— 'Nachträge', *RevQ* 14 (1963), pp.163-234.

Lake, K. (ed.) *The Apostolic Fathers* (Loeb). London: Heinemann, 1914.

Lauterbach, J.Z. (ed.) *Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1933-1935.

Leaney, A.R.C. *The Rule of* **Qumran** *and its Meaning. Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. London: SCM, 1966.

Legg, S.C.E. **Novum Testamentum** *Graece*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940.

Lieberman, S. (ed.) *The* **Tosefta**. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1955-1973.

Lindsey, R. (ed.) *A Comparative Greek Concordance of the Synoptic Gospels* (collator and compiler: Elmar Camillo Dos Santos). Jerusalem: Dutgith, 1985-1989.

Lisowsky, G. *Konkordanz zum hebräischen Alten Testament*. Stuttgart: PWB, 1958.

Lohse, E. (ed.) *Rabbinische Texte: Die Tosefta*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1956.

Massaux, É. The **Influence** *of the Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Literature before Saint Irenaeus*. Books 1-3 (trans. N.J. Belval & S. Hecht). Leuven: Peeters, 1986.

Melmoth, W. (ed.) *Pliny* (Loeb). London: Heinemann, 1927.

Ménard, J.-É. *L'Évangile selon* **Thomas**. Leiden: Brill, 1975.

Metzger, B.M. *A Textual* **Commentary** *on the Greek New Testament*. London: UBS, 1975.

Milik, J.T. *The Books of Enoch, Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.

Miller, W. (ed.) *Cicero. De Officiis* (Loeb). London: Heinemann, 1951.

Morgenthaler, R. **Statistik** *des neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes*. Zürich: Gotthelf, 1958.

Moulton, J.H. — *A* **Grammar** *of New Testament Greek.* Edinburgh. Vols. 1-4 (Vol. 4 by N. Turner): T. & T. Clark, 1978[3].

Moulton, J.H. & Milligan, R. — *The* **Vocabulary** *of the Greek New Testament.* London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1930.

Norman, A.F. (ed.) — *Libanius* (Loeb). London: Heinemann, 1969.

Norsa, M. (ed.) — *Papyri greci e latini.* Pubblicazioni della Societa Italiana. Florence: Le Monnier, 1953.

Oldfather, W. (ed.) — *Epictetus* (Loeb). London: Heinemann, 1928.

Parrott, D.M. (ed.) — *Nag Hammadi* **Codices**. Leiden: Brill, 1979.

Perry, B.E. (ed.) — *Babrius and Phaedrus* (Loeb). London: Heinemann, 1965.

Quispel, G. — **Makarius**, *das Thomasevengalium und das Lied von der Perle (in den Thomasakten).* Leiden: Brill, 1967.

Reider, J. — *An Index to Aquila* (revised by N. Turner). Leiden: Brill, 1966.

Rengstorf, K.H. (ed.) — *A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus.* Vols. I–III. Leiden: Brill, 1973-1979.

Robinson, J.M. (ed.) — *The Nag Hammadi Library in English.* Leiden: Brill, 1977.

Ryle, H. & James, M. — *The* **Psalms of Solomon**. Cambridge: University Press, 1891.

Saldarini, A.J. — *The Fathers according to Rabbi* **Nathan** *(Version B).* Leiden: Brill, 1975.

Scherer, J. (ed.) — *Textes et Documents* VII: *Papyrus de Philadelphie.* Paris, 1897.

Schiffman, L.H. — *The Halakah at Qumran.* Leiden: Brill, 1975.

Schrage, W. — *Das Verhältnis des* **Thomas-Evangeliums** *zur synoptischen Tradition und zu den koptischen Evangelien. Übersetzungen, zugleich ein Beitrag zur gnostischen Synoptikerdeutung.* Berlin: Töpelmann, 1964.

Schwab, M. (ed.) — *Le* **Talmud** *de Jerusalem.* 11 Vols. Paris: G.-P. Maisonneuve, 1932-1933.

Smith, J.P. — *A Compendious* **Syriac** *Dictionary.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1903

Sperber, R. — *The Bible in Aramaic.* Leiden: Brill, 1962.

Strack, H.L. & Billerbeck, P. — **Kommentar** *zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch.* 4 Vols. Munich: Beck, 1961[3].

Stroker, W. — *Extracanonical Sayings of Jesus.* Atlanta: Scholars' Press, 1989.

Thackeray, H.St.J. (ed.) — *Josephus* (Loeb). London: Heinemann, 1928.

Theodor, J. & Albeck, C. (edd.) — *Bereschit Rabbah.* Jerusalem: Wahrmann, 1965[2].

Turner, N. & Moulton, J.H. — *A* **Grammar** *of New Testament Greek.* Vol. III. Edinburgh: Clark, 1963.

van der Ploeg, J.P. — *Le Targum de Job de la Grotte XI de Qumran.* Leiden: Brill, 1971.

Wernberg-Møller, P. — *The* **Manual** *of Discipline.* Leiden: Brill, 1957.

Werner, A. — 'Die Apokalypse des Petrus.' *TLZ* 99 (1974), Sp.576-579.

Yadin, Y. *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness.* London: OUP, 1962.

Yoder, J. *Concordance to the Distinctive Greek Text of Codex Bezae.* Leiden: Brill, 1961.

Zaphiris, G. *Le texte de l'Évangile selon Saint* **Matthieu**, *d'après les citations de Clément d'Alexandrie comparées aux citations des Pères et des théologiens grecs du II^e au XV^e siècle.* Gembloux: Duculot, 1970.

Zerwick, M. *Graecitas Biblica.* Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966[5].

Ziegler, J. *Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Adacemiae Scientiarum Gottingensis.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974.

Zuckermandel, M. *Tosephta.* Jerusalem: Wahrmann, 1970.

2. *MATTHEAN SECONDARY SOURCES*

Agbanou, V.K. *Le* **discours** *eschatologique de Matthieu 24-25: tradition et rédaction.* Paris: Gabalda, 1983.

Aichinger, H. 'Quellenkritische Untersuchung der Perikope vom **Ährenraufen** am Sabbat Mc 2, 23-28 par Mt 12, 1-8 par Lk 6, 1-5.' In *Jesus in der Verkündigung der Kirche* (ed. A. Fuchs). Freistadt Linz: Plöchl, 1976.

Albright, W. & Mann, C. **Matthew.** Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1971.

Allen, W. *The Gospel According to St.* **Matthew**. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1907, 1912[3].

Allison, D.C. 'The **Son of God** as Israel. A Note on Matthean Christology.' *Irish Biblical Studies* 9 (1987), pp.74-81.

—— 'The **Structure** of the Sermon on the Mount.' *JBL* 106 (1987), pp.423-445.

Anderson, J.C. 'Double and Triple **Stories**, the Implied Reader, and Redundancy in Matthew.' *Semeia* 31 (1985), pp.71-90.

—— *Matthew's* **Narrative Web**. *Over, and Over, and Over Again.* Sheffield: JSOT, 1994.

Argyle, A. *The Gospel According to St.* **Matthew**. Cambridge: CUP, 1964.

Bacon, B. **Studies** *in Matthew.* New York: Holt & Co., 1930.

Balch, D.L. 'The Greek **Political Topos** περὶ νόμων and Matthew 5:17,19, and 16:19.' In *Social History of the Matthean Community. Cross-Disciplinary Approaches* (ed. D. Balch). Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.

Barnett, P.W. 'Who were the '**Biastai**' (Mt 11.12-13)?' *Reformed Theological Review* 36 (1977), pp.55-70.

Barrett, C.K. 'The **House of Prayer** and the Den of Thieves.' In *Jesus und Paulus. Festschrift für Werner Georg Kümmel zum 70. Geburtstag* (edd. E. Ellis & E. Grässer). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975, pp.13-20.

Barth, G. '**Das Gesetzesverständnis** des Evangelisten Matthäus.' In G. Bornkamm – G. Barth – H. Held, *Überlieferung und Auslegung im Matthäusevangelium.* Neukirchen: Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins, 1968⁵, pp.54-154.

—— 'Auseinandersetzungen um die **Kirchenzucht** im Umkreis des Matthäusevangeliums.' *ZNW* 69 (1978), pp.158-174.

Basser, H.W. 'Derrett's **'Binding'** Reopened.' *JBL* 104 (1985), pp.297-300.

Bauer, D. *The* **Structure** *of Matthew's Gospel.* Sheffield: JSOT, 1988.

Baumbach, G. *Das Verständnis des* **Bösen** *in den Synoptischen Evangelien.* Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1963.

—— 'Die **Mission** im Matthäus-Evangelium.' *TLZ* 92 (1967), Sp.889-893.

Beare, F. 'The Mission of the Disciples and the Mission Charge: **Matthew 10** and Parallels.' *JBL* 89 (1970), pp.1-13.

—— *The Gospel according to* **Matthew**. Oxford: Blackwell, 1981.

Benoit, P. *L'Évangile selon S.* **Matthieu**. Paris: Cerf, 1950.

Betz, H.D. *Essays on the* **Sermon** *on the Mount.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.

Black, D. 'Conjectural Emendations in the Gospel of Matthew.' *NovT* 31 (1989), pp.1-15.

Blair, E. *Jesus in the Gospel of* **Matthew**. New York: Abingdon, 1960.

Blank, J. 'Neutestamentliche Petrus-Typologie und **Petrusamt.**' *Concilium* 9 (1973), pp.173-179.

Böcher, O. '**Wölfe** in Schafspelzen: Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund von Mt. 7, 15.' *TZ* 24 (1968), pp.405-426.

—— **Christus** *Exorcistica.* Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1972.

Böhl, F. 'Die **Demut** als höchste der Tugenden. Bemerkungen zu Mt 5, 3. 5.' *BZ* N.F. 20 (1976), pp.217-223.

Bonnard, P. *L'Évangile selon Saint* **Matthieu**. Neuchâtel: Editions Delachaux et Niestlé, 1963, 1970.

Bornkamm, G. 'Matthäus als **Interpret** der Herrenworte.' *TLZ* 79 (1954), Sp.341-346.

—— Article: **Evangelien**. *RGG* II³.

—— '**Enderwartung** und Kirche im Matthäusevangelium' & '**Sturmstillung**'. In G. Bornkamm – G. Barth – M. Held, *Überlieferung und Auslegung in Matthäusevangelium.* Neukirchen: Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins, 1961, 1963, 1968⁵.

—— 'Der **Auferstandene** und der Irdische.' In *Zeit und Geschichte. Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann zum 80. Geburtstag* (ed. E. Dinkler). Tübingen: Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1964, pp. 171-192.

—— '**Die Verzögerung** der Parusie', in G. Bornkamm, *Geschichte und Glaube* I. Munich: Kaiser, 1968, pp.46-55.

—— '**Die Binde- und Lösegewalt** in der Kirche des Matthäus.' English translation: 'The Authority to 'Bind' and 'Loose' in the Church in Matthew's Gospel'. In *Jesus and Man's Hope* I (edd. D. Hadidian et al.). Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, 1970, pp.37-50.

—— 'Aufbau der **Bergpredigt.**' *NTS* 24 (1978) pp.419-432ff.

Brent, A. 'Pseudonymity and **Charisma** in the Ministry of the Early Church.' *Augustinianum* 27 (1987), pp.347-376.

Broer, I. *Freiheit vom* **Gesetz** *und Radikalisierung des Gesetzes. Ein Beitrag zur Theologie des Evangelisten Matthäus.* Stuttgart: SBS, 1980.

—— *Die* **Seligpreisungen** *der Bergpredigt. Studien zu ihrer Überlieferung und Interpretation.* Hanstein: Königstein, 1986.

Brown, J. '**The Form of 'Q'** Known to Matthew.' *NTS* 8 (1961-62), pp.27-42.

Brown, R.E. **Peter** *in the New Testament. A Collaborative Assessment by Protestant and Roman Catholic Scholars.* Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, Chapman, 1974.

—— *The* **Birth** *of the Messiah.* London: Chapman, 1993.

—— *The* **Death** *of the Messiah.* London: Chapman, 1994.

Brown, S. 'The Two-Fold Representation of the **Mission** in Matthew's Gospel.' *ST* 31 (1977), pp.21-32.

—— 'The Matthean **Apocalypse**.' *JSNT* 4 (1979), pp.2-27.

—— 'The Matthean **Community** and the Gentile Mission.' *NovT* 22 (1980), pp.193-221.

Burger, C. *Jesus als* **Davidssohn**. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970.

—— 'Jesu **Taten** nach Matthäus 8 und 9.' *ZTK* 70 (1973), pp.272-287.

Burnett, F.W. *The Testament of Jesus-***Sophia**: *A Redaction-Critical Study of the Eschatological Discourse in Matthew.* New York: University Press of America, 1981.

—— '**Paliggenesia** in Matt. 19:28. A window on the Matthean Community.' *JSNT* 17 (1983), pp.60-72.

Butler, B. *The* **Originality** *of St. Matthew.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1951.

Cadbury, H. '**Review. Hartman**: *Testimonium Linguae*'. *HTR* 57 (1965), pp.164-165.

Cameron, P.S. **Violence** *and the Kingdom. The Interpretation of Mt 11.12.* Frankfurt: Lang, 1984.

Campbell, K.M. 'The New **Jerusalem** in Matthew 5.14.' *SJT* 31 (1978), pp.335-363.

Carlston, C. 'The Things That Defile (Mark vii. 14) and the **Law** in Matthew and Mark.' *NTS* 15 (1968-69), pp.75-96.

Carson, D.A. **Matthew**. *Expositor's Bible Commentary*, Vol. 8. Michigan: Zondervan, 1984.

Carter, W. **Households** *and Discipleship. A Study of Matthew 19-20.* Sheffield: JSOT, 1994.

Casey, M. 'The **Jackals** and the Son of Man. (Matt 8.20/Luke 9.58).' *JSNT* (1985), pp.3-22.

Charette, B. *The Theme of* **Recompense** *in Matthew's Gospel.* Sheffield: JSNTS, 1992.

Chilton, B. 'Shebna, Eliakim, and the **Promise to Peter**.' In *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity* (ed. D. Flusser). Jerusalem: Magness, 1988, pp.311-324.

Clark, K. 'The **Gentile** Bias of Matthew.' *JBL* 66 (1947), pp.165-172.

Cope, O.L. **Matthew**: *A Scribe Trained for the Kingdom of Heaven.* Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1976.

—— ' 'To the **Close of the Age**': The Role of Apocalyptic Thought in the Gospel of Matthew.' In *Apocalyptic and the New Testament* (edd. J. Marcus & M. Soards). Sheffield: JSOT, 1989.

Davies, M. **Matthew**. Sheffield: JSOT, 1993.

Davies, W.D. *The Setting of the* **Sermon** *on the Mount.* Cambridge: CUP, 1966.

Davies, W.D. & Allison, D. *The Gospel According to St* **Matthew**. Vols. 1-2. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988-1992.

Davison, J.E. '**Anomia** and the Question of an Antinomian Polemic in Matthew.' *JBL* 104 (1985), pp.617-635.

De Kruijf, T. *Der* **Sohn** *des lebendigen Gottes. Ein Beitrag zur Christologie des Matthäusevangeliums.* Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1962.

Denaux, A. '**Criteria** for Identifying Q-Passages.' *NovT* 37 (1995), pp.105-129.

Derrett, D.J. '**Binding** and Loosing (Mt 16:19; 18:13; John 29:23).' *JBL* 102 (1983), pp.112-117.

—— '**Palingenesia** (Matthew 19.28).' *JSNT* 20 (1984) pp. 51-58.

Descamps, A. '**Rédaction** et christologie dans la récit matthéen de la Passion.' In *L'Évangile selon Matthieu: rédaction et théologie* (ed. M. Didier). Gembloux: Duculot, 1972, pp.359-415.

Deutsch, C. *Hidden* **Wisdom** *and the Easy Yoke.* Sheffield: JSOT, 1987.

Dodd, C.H. '**Matthew** and Paul.' In C.H. Dodd, *New Testament Studies*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1967, pp.53-66.

Donaldson, T.L. *Jesus on the* **Mountain**: *A Study in Matthean Theology.* Sheffield: JSOT, 1985.

Dupont, J. 'Le logion de **douze trônes** (Mt.19, 28; Lc 22, 28-30).' *Bib* 45 (1964), pp.361-362.

—— 'Matthieu 18.3 ἐὰν μὴ στραφῆτε καὶ γενῆσθε ὡς.' In *Neotestamentica et Semitica* (edd. E. Ellis & M. Wilcox). Edinburgh: T. &. T. Clark, 1969, pp.50-60.

Edwards, J.R. 'The Use of ΠΡΟΣΕΡΧΕΣΘΑΙ in the Gospel of **Matthew**.' *JBL* 106 (1987), pp.65-74.

Edwards, R.A. 'Matthew's use of Q in Chapter **Eleven**.' In *Logia. Les paroles de Jésus* (ed. J. Delobel). Leuven: Peeters, pp.257-275.

Elliott, J.H. *A Home for the* **Homeless**. *A Sociological Exegesis of 1 Peter, its Situation and Strategy*. London: SCM, 1981.

Emerton, J.A. '**Binding** and Loosing—Forgiving and Retaining.' *JTS* 13 (1962), pp.325-331.

—— 'The **Problem** of Vernacular Hebrew in the First Century A.D. and the Language of Jesus.' *JTS* 24 (1973), pp.8-13.

Ennulat, A. *Die* '**Minor Agreements**'. Tübingen: Mohr, 1993.

Falk, Z.W. '**Binding** and Loosing.' *JJS* 25 (1974), pp.92-100.

Fenton, J. *The Gospel of St.* **Matthew**. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1968; Pelican, 1963.

Feuillet, A. 'Le sens du mot **Parousie** dans l'Évangile de Matthieu.' In *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology. In honour of Charles Harold Dodd* (edd. W.D. Davies & D. Daube). Cambridge: CUP, 1956.

Fiedler, M. *Der Begriff* **Diakaiosyne** *im Matthäus-Evangelium, auf seine Grundlagen untersucht.* Unpublished Thesis. Halle, 1957.

Filson, F. *A Commentary on the Gospel According to* **Matthew**. London: Black, 1960.

Fitzmyer, J. 'The Use of Explicit Old Testament **Quotations** in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament.' *NTS* 7 (1960-61), pp.297-333.

Frankemölle, H. **Jahwebund** *und Kirche Christi*. Münster: Aschendorff, 1973.

—— '**Amtskritik** in Matthäus-Evangelium.' *Bib* 54 (1973), pp.247-262.

—— '**Evangelist und Gemeinde**. Eine methodenkritische Besinnung (mit Beispielen aus dem Mattäus-evangelium).' *Bib* 60 (1979), pp.153-190.

Fuchs, A. *Sprachliche* **Untersuchungen** *zu Matthäus und Lukas. Ein Beitrag zur Quellenkritik*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1971.

Gaechter, P. *Das* **Matthäus** *Evangelium*. Stuttgart: KBW, 1963.

Garland, D.E. *The Intention of* **Matthew 23**. Leiden: Brill, 1979.

Gibbs, J. '**Purpose and Pattern** in Matthew's use of the Title 'Son of David'.' *NTS* 10 (1964), pp.446-464.

—— '**The Son of God** as the Torah Incarnate in Matthew.' In *Studia Evangelica* IV (ed. F. Cross). Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1968, pp.38-46.

Giblin, C.H. — 'Structural and Thematic Correlations in the Matthean Burial-Resurrection Narrative (Matt. xxvii.57–xxviii.20).' *NTS* 21 (1974-75), pp.406-420.

Gnilka, J. — 'Die **Kirche** des Matthäus und die Gemeinde von Qumrân.' *BZ* N.F. 7 (1963), pp.43-63.

—— — *Das* **Matthäusevangelium**. Freiburg: Herder Verlag, 1988.

Gnuse, R. — 'Dream **Genre** in the Matthean Infancy Narratives.' *NovT* 32 (1990), pp.97-120.

Gooding, D.W. — '**Structure** littéraire de Matthieu XIII,63 à XVIII,35.' *RevB* 17 (1978), pp.227-252.

Goulder, M. — **Midrash** *and Lection in Matthew*. London: SPCK, 1974.

Grams, R. — 'The Temple **Conflict** Scene: A Rhetorical Analysis of Matthew 21-23.' In *Persuasive Artistry. Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in honor of George A. Kennedy* (ed. D.F. Watson). Sheffield: JSNTS, 1991, pp.41-65.

Green, H.B. — *The Gospel According to* **Matthew**. Oxford: OUP, 1975.

Grindel, J. — '**Matthew** 12, 18-21.' *CBQ* 29 (1967), pp.110-115.

Grundmann, W. — *Das Evangelium nach* **Matthäus**. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1968.

Gundry, R.H. — *The Use of the* **Old Testament** *in St. Matthew's Gospel*. Leiden: Brill, 1967.

—— — **Matthew**: *A Commentary on his Literary and Theological Art*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.

—— — *Matthew. A Commentary on his* **Handbook** *for a Mixed Church under Persecution*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994[2].

Haenchen, E. — '**Matthäus 23**.' *ZTK* 48 (1951), pp.38-63.

Hagner, D. — **Matthew** *1-13*. Dallas: Word Books, 1993.

Hahn, F. — 'Die **eschatologische Rede**. Matthäus 24 und 25.' In *Studien zum Matthäusevangelium. Festschrift für Wilhelm Pesch* (ed. L. Schenke). Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1988, pp.110-126.

Hamerton-Kelly, R.G. — *Pre-Existence,* **Wisdom** *and the Son of Man*. Cambridge: CUP, 1973.

Hare, D. — *The Theme of Jewish* **Persecution** *of Christians in the Gospel According to St. Matthew*. Cambridge: CUP, 1967.

Hare, D. & Harrington, D. — 'Make **Disciples** of All the Gentiles.' *CBQ* 37 (1985), pp.359-369.

Heil, J.P. — *Jesus Walking on the* **Sea**. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1981.

Held, H. — 'Matthäus als Interpret der **Wundergeschichten**.' G. Bornkamm – G. Barth – H. Held, *Überlieferung und Auslegung im Matthäus-Evangelium*. Neukirchen: Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins, 1968[5], pp.155-288.

Hickling, C. — 'Review. Orton: *The Understanding Scribe*.' *JTS* 42 (1991), pp.189-191.

Hiers, R.H. — '**Binding**' and 'Loosing': The Matthean Authorizations.' *JBL* 104 (1985), pp.233-250.

Higgins, A.J. — '**The Sign** of the Son of Man (Matt xxiv.30).' *NTS* 9 (1963), pp.380-382.

Hill, D. — '**Dikaioi** as a Quasi-Technical Term.' *NTS* 11 (1965), pp.296-302.

—— — *The Gospel of* **Matthew**. London: Oliphants, 1972.

—— — '**False Prophets** and Charismatics: Structure and Interpretation in Matthew 7, 15-23.' *Bib* 5 (1976), pp.327-348.

—— — '**Son and Servant**: An Essay on Matthean Christology.' *JSNT* 7 (1980), pp.2-16.

Holmes, M. — 'The Text of the Matthean **Divorce** Passages: A Comment on the Appeal to Harmonization in Textual Decisions.' *JBL* 109 (1990), pp.651-664.

Hommel, H. — 'Die **Tore** des Hades.' *ZNW* 80 (1989), pp.124-125.

Howell, D. — *Matthew's* **Inclusive** *Story: A Study in the Narrative Rhetoric of the First Gospel.* Sheffield: JSOT, 1990.

Hubbard, B.J. — *The Matthean Redaction of a Primitive Apostolic Commissioning: An Exegesis of* **Matthew 28: 16-20**. Montana: Scholars' Press, 1974.

Hummel, R. — *Die* **Auseinandersetzung** *zwischen Kirche und Judentum im Matthäusevangelium.* Munich: Kaiser, 1963, 1966[2].

Jensen, J. — 'Does πορνεία mean Fornication? A **Critique** of Bruce Malina.' *NovT* 20 (1978), pp.161-184.

Jeremias, J. — '**Lass allda** deine Gabe (Mt 5:23f).' In J. Jeremias, *Abba. Studien zur neutestamentlichen Theologie und Zeitgeschichte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966, pp.103-107; also *ZNW* 36 (1937), pp.150-154.

—— — '**Die Muttersprache** des Evangelisten Matthäus.' In J. Jeremias, *Abba. Studien zur neutestamentlichen Theologie und Zeitgeschichte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966, pp.255-260; also *ZNW* 50 (1959), pp.270-275.

Jones, I.H. — **Matthew 18**. Unpublished M.Litt. Thesis. University of Bristol, 1978.

—— — '**Musical Instruments**.' In *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Vol. 4. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

—— — **Matthew**. London: Epworth, 1994.

Kähler, C. — 'Zur Form- und **Traditionsgeschichte** von Mt. xvi 17-19.' *NTS* 23 (1977), pp.36-58.

Kahmann, J. — 'Die **Verheissung** an Petrus.' In *L'Évangile selon Matthieu: rédaction et théologie* (ed. M. Didier). Gembloux: Duculot, 1972, pp.261-280.

Kilpatrick, G. — *The* **Origins** *of the Gospel According to St. Matthew.* Oxford: OUP, 1946.

Kingsbury, J. — 'The **Structure** of Matthew's Gospel and his Concept of Salvation-History.' *CBQ* 35 (1973), pp.451-474.

—— — 'The **Composition** and Christology of Matt. 28:16-20.' *JBL* 93 (1974), pp.573-584.

—— **Matthew**: *Structure, Christology, Kingdom*. London: SPCK, 1976.

—— 'The Verb '**Akolouthein**' ('To Follow') as an Index of Matthew's View of his Community.' *JBL* 97 (1978), pp.56-73.

—— *Matthew as* **Story**. London: SPCK, 1988[2].

Kirchgässner, A. 'Im Herzen der Erde. Zur Symbolsprache von **Mt. 12, 40**.' In *Das Evangelium auf dem Weg zum Menschen, zur Vermittlung und zum Vollzug des Glaubens* (ed. O. Knoch). Frankfurt: J. Knecht, 1973.

Kissinger, W.S. *The* **Sermon** *on the Mount. A History of Interpretation and Bibliography*. Metuchen: Scarecrow Press, 1975.

Klein, H. 'Judenchristliche **Frömmigkeit** im Sondergut des Matthäus.' *NTS* 35 (1989), pp.466-474.

—— 'Zur **Traditionsgeschichte** von Mt 16,16b-17. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Frühgeschichte der christlichen Taufe.' In *Christus Bezeugen* (edd. K. Kertelge & T. Holz). Freiburg: Herder, 1990, pp.124-126.

Klostermann, E. *Das* **Matthäus**-*Evangelium*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1927[2].

Knowles, M. **Jeremiah** *in Matthew's Gospel. The Rejected-Prophet Motif in Matthean Redaction*. Sheffield: JSNTS, 1993.

Krämer, M. 'Hütet euch vor den falschen **Propheten**.' *Bib* 57 (1976), pp.349-357.

Krentz, E. 'The Extent of Matthew's Prologue. Toward the Structure of the First Gospel.' *JBL* 83 (1964), pp.409-414.

Kretzer, A. *Die* **Herrschaft** *der Himmel und die Söhne des Reiches*. Würzburg: Echter, 1971.

Künzel, G. **Studien** *zum Gemeindeverständnis des Matthäus-Evangeliums*. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1978.

Lagrange, M.-J. *Évangile selon Saint* **Matthieu**. Paris: Le Coffre, 1923, 1948.

Lambert, G. 'Lier–délier. L'expression de la totalité par l'opposition de deux **contraires**.' *RevB* 3 (1945), pp.91-103.

Lambrecht, J. 'The **Parousia** Discourse: Composition and Content in Mt. xxiv-xxv.' In *L'Évangile selon Matthieu: rédaction et théologie* (ed. M. Didier). Gembloux: Duculot, 1972, pp.309-342.

—— *Out of the* **Treasure**. *The Parables in the Gospel of Matthew*. Louvain: Peeters, 1991.

Lampe, G. 'Peter's **Denial**.' *BJRL* 56 (1973), pp.346ff.

Lampe, P. 'Das **Spiel** mit dem Petrusnamen—Matt. xvi.18.' *NTS* 25 (1979), pp.227-245.

Lange, J. *Das Erscheinen des Auferstandenen im Evangelium nach* **Matthäus**. Würzburg: Echter, 1973.

Léon-Dufour, X. 'Vers l'annonce de l'Église, **Matthieu 14, 1-16, 20**.' In *L'Homme devant Dieu (Mélanges offerts au Père Henri de Lubac)*. Vol. 1. Paris: Cerf, 1963, pp.37-49.

L'Epplattenier, C. '**Matthieu** 21/10–24/2.' *Etudes théologiques et religieuses* 53 (1978), pp.514-518.

Levine, A. *The* **Social** *and Ethnic Dimensions of Matthean Salvation History*. Lewiston: Mellen, 1988.

Lindars, B. '**Matthew**, Levi, Lebbaeus and the Value of the Western Text.' *NTS* 4 (1957-58), pp.220-222.

Ljungman, H. *Das* **Gesetz** *erfüllen. Mt 5, 17ff. und 3,15 untersucht.* Lund: Gleerup, 1954.

Lohmeyer, E. '"**Mir ist gegeben** alle Gewalt!"' in *In Memoriam Ernst Lohmeyer* (ed. W. Schmauch). Stuttgart: Evangelischer Verlag, 1951, pp.22-49.

—— *Das Evangelium des* **Matthäus** (ed. W. Schmauch). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967.

Lohr, C.H. '**Oral** Techniques in the Gospel of Matthew.' *CBQ* 23 (1961), pp.403-435.

Lövestam, E. *Spiritual* **Wakefulness** *in the New Testament.* Lund: Gleerup, 1963.

—— *Spiritus* **Blasphemia**. *Eine Studie zu Mk.3,28f par Mt 12,31f, Lk 12,10.* Lund: Gleerup, 1968.

Luz, U. 'Die **Jünger** im Matthäusevangelium.' *ZNW* 62 (1971), pp.141-171.

—— *Das* **Evangelium** *nach Matthäus.* Vols. 1 and 1/2. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1985, 1990.

—— **Matthew** 1-7 (trans. W. Linss). Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1989.

—— 'Eine thetische Skizze der matthäischen **Christologie**.' In *Anfänge der Christologie. Festschrift für Ferdinand Hahn.* (edd. C. Breytenbach & H. Paulsen). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991, pp.221-235.

McConnell, R. **Law** *and Prophecy in Matthew's Gospel.* Basel: Fr. Reinhardt Kommissionsverlag, 1969.

M'Neile, A. *The Gospel According to St.* **Matthew**. London: Macmillan, 1915.

Mahoney, A. 'A new look at the **Divorce** Clauses in Mt 5,32 and 19,3.' *CBQ* 30 (1968), pp.29-38.

Malina, B. 'The Literary Structure and Form of **Matt.XXVIII.16-20**.' *NTS* 17 (1970), pp.87-103.

Marbury, K. *Old Testament Textual Traditions in the New Testament: Studies in* **Text-types**. Unpublished Thesis. Harvard, April 1968.

Marguerat, D. *Le jugement dans l'Évangile de* **Matthieu**. Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1981.

Martinez, E.R. 'The Interpretation of Hoi Mathetai in **Matthew 18**.' *CBQ* 23 (1961), pp.281-292.

Mead, R. 'The Healing of a **Paralytic**—a Unit?' *JBL* 80 (1961), pp.348-354.

Meier, J.P. **Law and History** *in Matthew's Gospel.* Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976.

—— 'Nations or Gentiles in **Matthew 28:19?**' *CBQ* 39 (1977), pp.94-102.

—— 'Two Disputed Questions in **Matt 28:16-20**.' *JBL* 96 (1977), pp.407-424.

—— **The Vision of Matthew.** *Christ, Church and Morality in the First Gospel.* New York: Paulist Press, 1979.

Michaelis, C. 'Die π-Alliteration der Subjektworte der ersten 4 Seligpreisungen in Mt v 3-6 und ihre Bedeutung für den **Aufbau** der Seligpreisungen bei Mt–Lk. und in Q'. *NovT* 10 (1968), pp.148-161.

Minear, P. 'The **Disciples** *and the Crowds in the Gospel of Matthew.*' *ATR* Supplementary Series 3 (1974), pp.28-44.

—— '**False Prophecy** and Hypocrisy in the Gospel of Matthew.' In *Neues Testament und Kirche* (ed. J. Gnilka). Freiburg: Herder, 1974, pp.76-93.

Mohrlang, R. **Matthew** *and Paul: A Comparison of Ethical Perspectives.* Cambridge: CUP, 1984.

Moloney, F. 'Matthew 19,3-12 and **Celibacy**. A Redactional and Form Critical Study.' *JSNT* 2 (1979), pp.42-60.

Moore, H. 'ΒΙΑΖΩ/ΑΡΠΑΖΩ and **Cognates** in Josephus.' *NTS* 21 (1975), pp.519-543.

Moule, C.F.D. '**Matthew 5.21,22**.' *ExpTim* 50 (1938-39), pp.189-190.

—— '**St. Matthew's Gospel**: Some Neglected Features.' *Studia Evangelica* II (ed. F. Cross). Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1964, pp.91-99.

Murphy-O'Connor, J. 'The **Structure** of Matthew XIV-XVII.' *RevB* 14 (1975), pp.306-384.

Neirynck, F. 'The Gospel of Matthew and **Literary Criticism**.' In *L'Évangile selon Matthieu: rédaction et théologie* (ed. M. Didier). Gembloux: Duculot, 1972, pp.37-69.

Nepper-Christensen, P. *Das* **Matthäusevangelium**. *Ein judenchristliches Evangelium?* Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget, 1958.

Neugebauer, F. 'Die **Davidssohnfrage** (Mk xxi, 35-37 par.) und der Menschensohn.' *NTS* 21 (1975), pp.81-108.

Neyrey, J. 'The **Thematic Use** of Isaiah 42,1-4 in Matthew 12.' *Bib* 63 (1982), pp.457-473.

Nolan, B.M. *The Royal* **Son** *of God. The Christology of Matthew 1-2 in the setting of the Gospel.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979.

Ogawa, A. **L'histoire** *de Jésus chez Matthieu. La signification de l'histoire pour la théologie matthéene.* Europe: Hochschulschrift, 23.116, 1979. Frankfurt: Lang, 1979.

Olsthoorn, M.F. *The Jewish* **Background** *and the Synoptic Setting of Mt 6:25-33 and Lk 12:22-31.* Jerusalem: Franciscan, 1975.

O'Rourke, J. 'The **Fulfilment** Texts in Matthew.' *CBQ* 24 (1962), pp.394-403.

—— 'A Note on an Exception: **Mt 5, 31** (19, 9) and 1 C 7, 12 Compared.' *Heythrop Journal* 5 (1964), pp.299-302.

Overmann, J.A. *Matthew's Gospel and* **Formative Judaism**. *The Social World of the Matthean Community.* Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.

Pamment, M. (see also Davies) '**Singleness** and Matthew's Attitude to the Torah.' *JSNT* 17 (1983), pp.73-86.

Patte, D. *The Gospel according to* **Matthew**. *A Structural Commentary on Matthew's Faith.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.

—— 'Prolegomena to a Study of the Disciples in Matthew.' Paper to the Matthean Seminar at the *Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas.*

Payne, P. '**Midrash** and History in the Gospels with special reference to R.H. Gundry's Matthew.' In *Gospel Perspectives* (edd. R.T. France & D. Wenham), Vol. 3. Sheffield: JSOT, 1983, pp 177-215.

Pedersen, S. 'Die Proklamation Jesu als des eschatologischen Offenbarungsträgers.' *NovT* 27 (1975), pp.241-264.

Pesch, W. 'Die sogenannte **Gemeindeordnung** Mt. 18.' *BZ* N.F. 7 (1963), pp.220-235.

—— *Matthäus der* **Seelsorger**. *Das neue Verständnis der Evangelien dargestellt am Beispiel von Matthäus 18.* Stuttgart: KBW, 1966.

—— '**Der Gottessohn** im matthäischen Evangelienprolog.' *Bib* 48 (1967), pp.395-420.

—— '**Levi-Matthäus** (Mc 2:14/Mt 9:9; 10:3), ein Beitrag zur Lösung eines alten Problems.' *ZNW* 59 (1968), pp.40-56.

Plummer, A. *An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to* **S. Matthew**. London: Stock, 1909.

Pokorný, P. *Der* **Kern** *der Bergpredigt.* Hamburg: Evangelischer Verlag, 1969.

Popkes, W. 'Die Gerechtigkeitstradition im Matthäus-Evangelium.' *ZNW* 81 (1990), pp.1-23.

Powell, M.A. 'The **Plot and Subplots** of Matthew's Gospel.' *NTS* 38 (1992), pp.187-204.

What is **Narrative** *Criticism?* Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.

Prabhu, G.M.S. *The Formula* **Quotations** *in the Infancy Narrative of Matthew.* Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976.

Przybylski, B. **Righteousness** *in Matthew and his World of Thought.* Cambridge: CUP, 1980.

Punge, M. '**Endgeschehen** und Heilsgeschichte in Matthäus-Evangelium.' Dissertation. Greifswald, 1961.

Riesenfeld, H. 'Vom Schätzesammeln und Sorgen—ein Thema urchristlicher Paränese. Zu Mt.vi 19-34.' In *Neotestamentica et Patristica* (ed. W.C. van Unnik). Brill: Leiden, 1962, pp.47-58.

Rothfuchs, W. von *Die* **Erfüllungszitate** *des Matthäus-Evangeliums: Eine biblisch-theologische Untersuchung.* Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1969.

Rowland, C. '**Mysticism**, The Poor, and the New Testament.' Manson Lecture, 1992.

Rustad, J.O. 'Matthew's Attitude to the **Law** in Matt 19:16-22.' Unpublished Thesis. Chicago, 1976.

Saldarini, A. *Matthew's Christian-Jewish* **Community**. Chicago: University Press, 1994.

Sand, A. *Das* **Gesetz** *und die Propheten.* Regensburg: Pustet, 1974.

—— *Das* **Evangelium** *nach Matthäus.* Regensburg: Pustet, 1986.

Schaberg, J. *The* **Father**, *the Son and the Holy Spirit. The Triadic Phrase in Matthew 28:19b.* Chico: Scholars Press, 1980.

Schenk, W. 'Das Praesens historicum als macrosyntaktisches **Gliederungssignal** im Matthäusevangelium.' *NTS* 22 (1975), pp.464-475.

—— *Die* **Sprache** *des Matthäus.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987.

Schieber, H. '**Konzentrik** *im Matthäus-Schluss.* Ein form- und gattungkritischer Versuch zu Mt 28:16-20.' Diplomarbeit. Bamberg, 1976.

Schlatter, A. *Der Evangelist* **Matthäus**: *Seine Sprache, sein Ziel, seine Selbständigkeit.* Stuttgart: 1948, 1959[5].

Schmid, J. *Das Evangelium nach* **Matthäus**. Regensburg: Pustet, 1965[5].

Schnackenburg, R. *Gottes* **Herrschaft** *und Reich.* Freiburg: Herder, 1959.

Schniewind, J. *Das Evangelium nach* **Matthäus**. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968.

Schönle, V. **Johannes**, *Jesus und die Juden: Die theologischen Position des Matthäus und des Verfassers der Redenquelle im Lichte von Mt 11.* Frankfurt: Lang, 1982.

Schürmann, H. *Traditionsgeschichtliche* **Untersuchungen** *zu den Synoptischen Evangelien.* Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1968.

Schwarz, G. 'Matthäus v13a und 14a. **Emendation** und Rückübersetzung.' *NTS* 17 (1970), pp.80-85.

Schweizer, E. 'Observance of the **Law** and Charismatic Activity in Matthew.' *NTS* 16 (1969-70), pp.213-230.

—— '**The "Matthean" Church**.' *NTS* 20 (1973-74), p.216.

—— **Matthäus** *und seine Gemeinde.* Stuttgart: KBW, 1974.

—— *The Good News According to* **Matthew** (trans. D. Green). London: SPCK, 1976.

Senior, D. *The* **Passion** *Narrative According to Matthew.* Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1975.

Shuler, P.L. *A* **Genre** *for the Gospels. The Biographical Character of Matthew.* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.

Sigal, P. 'The **Halakah** of Jesus of Nazareth according to the Gospel of Matthew.' Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of Pittsburgh, 1979.

Silva, M. 'New Lexical **Semitisms**?' *ZNW* 69 (1978), pp.253-257.

—— '*Bilingualism* and the Character of Palestinian Greek.' In *The Language of the New Testament. Classic Essays* (ed. S.E. Porter). Sheffield: JSOT, 1991, pp.205-226.

Sim, D. 'The Meaning of παλιγγενεσία in Matthew 19.28.' *JSNT* 50 (1993) pp.3-12.

—— 'The Gospel of Matthew and the **Gentiles**.' *JSNT* 57 (1995), pp.19-48.

Smit Sibinga, J. 'Eine literarische **Technik** im Matthäusevangelium', in *L'Évangile selon Matthieu: rédaction et théologie* (ed. M. Didier). Gembloux: Duculot, 1972, pp.99-105.

Smith, C. 'The Mixed State of the **Church** in Matthew's Gospel.' *JBL* 82 (1963), pp.149-168.

Stanton, G.N. 'The Origin and Purpose of the **Sermon** on the Mount.' In *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament. Essays in honor of E. Earle Ellis* (edd. G.F. Hawthorne & O. Betz). Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987, pp.181-191.

—— *A* **Gospel** *for a New People.* Studies in Matthew. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1992.

Steck, O.H. **Israel** *und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten. Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum.* Neukirchen: Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins, 1967.

Stendahl, K. '**Matthew**.' *Peake's Commentary on The Bible.* London: Nelson, 1962, pp.769-798.

—— *The* **School** *of St. Matthew.* Lund: Gleerup, 1968[2].

Strecker, G. *Der Weg der* **Gerechtigkeit**: *Untersuchung zur Theologie des Matthäus.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962, 1971.

Suggs, M. **Wisdom**, *Christology, and Law in Matthew's Gospel.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970.

Suhl, A. 'Der **Davidssohn** im Matthäus-Evangelium.' *ZNW* 59 (1968), pp.57-81.

Tagawa, K. 'People and **Community** in the Gospel of Matthew.' *NTS* 16 (1969-70), pp.149-162.

Tevis, D.G. 'An **Analysis** of Words and Phrases Characteristic of the Gospel of Matthew.' Southern Methodist University Ph.D. Dissertation, 1983.

Thompson, W. *Matthew's Advice to a* **Divided Community**. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1970.

—— 'Reflections on the **Composition** of Mt 8:1–9,34.' *CBQ* 33 (1971), pp.365-388.

—— 'An **Historical Perspective** in the Gospel of Matthew.' *JBL* 93 (1974), pp.243-262.

Thysman, R. **Communauté** *et directives éthiques: la catéchèse de Matthieu.* Gembloux: Duculot, 1974.

Toussaint, S. 'The Introductory and Concluding **Parables** of Matthew Thirteen.' *Biblische Studien* 12 (1964), pp.351-355.

Trilling, W. *Das* **Wahre Israel**. Munich: Kösel, 1964[3].

——— 'Amt und Amtsverständnis bei Matthäus.' In *Mélanges bibliques en hommage au R.P. Béda Rigaux* (edd. A. Descamps & A. de Halleux). Gembloux: Duculot, 1970, pp.29-44.

Vaganay, L. 'La schématisme du **discours** communautaire dans la lumière de la critique des sources.' *RevB* 60 (1953), pp.203-244.

van Aarde, A.G. **God-with-us**. *The Dominant Perspective in Matthew's Story, and Other Essays.* Pretoria: Gutenberg, 1994.

van Segbroeck, F. 'Les **citations** d'accomplissement dans l'Évangile selon saint Matthieu d'après trois ouvrages récents.' In *L'Évangile selon Matthieu: rédaction et théologie* (ed. M. Didier). Gembloux: Duculot, 1972, pp.107-130.

van Tilborg, S. *The* **Jewish Leaders** *in Matthew.* Leiden: Brill, 1972.

Verseput, D.J. *The* **Rejection** *of the Humble Messianic King. A Study of the Composition of Matthew 11-12.* Frankfurt: Lang, 1986.

——— 'The Role and Meaning of the "**Son of God**" Title in Matthew's Gospel.' *NTS* 33 (1987), pp.532-556.

Vögtle, A. 'Das christologische und ekklesiologische Anliegen von **Mt 28, 18-20**.' In *Studia Evangelica* II (ed. F. Cross). Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1964, pp.266-294.

von Dobschütz, E. '**Matthäus** als Rabbi und Katechet.' *ZNW* 27 (1928), pp.338-348.

Walker, R. *Die* **Heilsgeschichte** *im ersten Evangelium.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967.

Weaver, D.J. *Matthew's* **Missionary** *Discourse.* Sheffield: JSOT, 1990.

Wenham, D. 'The **Structure** of Matthew XIII.' *NTS* 25 (1978), pp.516-522.

Wilcox, M. 'Peter and the **Rock**: A Fresh Look at Matthew XVI 17-19.' *NTS* 22 (1976), pp.73-88.

Wilkens, W. 'Die **Redaktion** des Gleichniskapitels Mark. 4 durch Matthäus.' *TZ* 20 (1964), pp.305-327.

Winandy, J. 'Le logion de l'**Ignorance** (Mc. xiii, 32, Mt. xxiv, 36).' *RevB* 75 (1968), pp.63-79.

Wong, K. **Interkulturelle** *Theologie und multikulturelle Gemeinde im Matthäusevangelium.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992.

Wrege, H.-T. *Die* **Überlieferung***sgeschichte der Bergpredigt.* Tübingen: Mohr, 1968.

Ziesler, J.A. '**Matthew** and the Presence of Jesus.' *EpR* 11/1 (1984), pp.55-63; 11/2 (1984), pp.90-97.

Zimmermann, H. 'Die Innere Struktur der Kirche und das Petrusamt nach **Mt 18**.' *Catholica* 30 (1976), pp.168-183.

3. *GENERAL NEW TESTAMENT*

Achtemeier, P. 'Omne Verbum Sonat: The New Testament and the **Oral** Environment of late Western Antiquity.' *JBL* 109 (1990), pp.3-27.

Allison, D.C. '**Elijah** must come first.' *JBL* 103 (1984), pp.256-258.

—— *The* **End of the Ages** *has Come: An Early Interpretation of the Passion and Resurrection of Jesus.* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.

Anderson, A. *The Gospel of* **Mark**. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1976.

Arens, E. *The* ΗΛΘΟΝ*-Sayings in the Synoptic* **Tradition**. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976.

Aune, D.E. **Prophecy** *in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.

—— *The New Testament in its Literary* **Environment**. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.

Banks, R. *Jesus and the* **Law** *in the Synoptic Tradition.* Cambridge: CUP, 1975.

Barr, J. *Biblical Words for* **Time**. London: SCM, 1969[2].

Barton, J. *People of the Book? The* **Authority** *of the Bible in Christianity.* London: SPCK, 1989.

Barton, S.C. *Discipleship and* **Family Ties** *in Mark and Matthew.* Cambridge: CUP, 1994.

Bartsch, H.W. 'Eine bisher übersehene **Zitierung** der LXX in Mark 4.30.' *TZ* 15 (1959), pp.126-128.

Baumbach, G. 'The **Sadducees** in Josephus.' In *Josephus, the Bible and History* (edd. L. Feldman & G. Hara). Leiden: Brill, 1989, pp.173-195.

Beck, B. *Christian Character in the Gospel of* **Luke**. London: Epworth, 1989.

Berger, K. *Die* **Amen-Worte** *Jesu.* Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 1970.

—— 'Zu den sogenannten **Sätzen heiligen Rechts**.' *NTS* 17 (1970-71), pp.10-40.

—— *Die* **Gesetzesauslegung** *Jesu.* Teil 1: *Markus und Parallelen.* Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1972.

—— 'Die königlichen **Messiastraditionen** des Neuen Testaments.' *NTS* 20 (1973-74), pp.1-44.

—— **Formgeschichte** *des Neuen Testaments.* Heidelberg: Quelle & Mayer, 1984.

Bergemann, T. *Q auf dem* **Prüfstand**. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993.

Beyer, K. *Semitische* **Syntax** *im Neuen Testament.* Band I: *Satzlehre*, Teil 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962.

Black, M. *An* **Aramaic** *Approach to the Gospels and Acts.* Oxford: OUP, 1946, 1967[3].

—— 'The **Christological** Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament.' *NTS* 18 (1971), pp.12-14.

Booth, R.P. *Jesus and the Laws of* **Purity**. *Tradition History and Legal History in Mark 7.* Sheffield: JSOT, 1986.

Borg, M.J. **Conflict**, *Holiness and Politics in the Teachings of Jesus.* New York: Mellen Press, 1984.

Bovon, F. **Luc** *le théologien.* Neuchâtel: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1978.

Bowker, J. *Problems of* **Suffering** *in the Religions of the World.* Cambridge: CUP, 1971.

Brown, S. *Apostasy and* **Perseverance** *in the Theology of Luke.* Rome: Pontifical Institute, 1969.

Bultmann, R. **Geschichte** *der synoptischen Tradition.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958[4].

Burridge, R. *What are the* **Gospels**? *A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography.* Cambridge: CUP, 1992.

Carlston, C.E. '**Proverbs**, Maxims and the Historical Jesus.' *JBL* 99 (1980), pp.87-105.

Caragounis, C.C. **Peter** *and the Rock.* Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 1990.

Casey, M. **Son of Man.** *The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7.* London: SPCK, 1979.

—— '**General**, Generic and Indefinite: The Use of the Term "Son of Man" in Aramaic Sources and in the Teaching of Jesus.' *JSNT* 3 (1979), 2ff.

—— 'The Original Aramaic Form of Jesus' Interpretation of the **Cup**.' *JTS* 41 (1990), pp.1-12.

Catchpole, D. 'The **Ravens**, the Lilies and the Q Hypothesis.' *Studien zum Neuen Testament and seiner Umwelt* 6-7 (1981-82), pp.77-87.

—— *The Quest for* **Q**. Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1993.

Chilton, B. *God in Strength. Jesus' Announcement of the Kingdom.* Freistadt: Plöchl, 1979.

—— *A Galilean* **Rabbi** *and his Bible.* London: SPCK, 1984.

Collins, R.F. '**Tradition**, Redaction and Exhortation in 1 Th 4,13-5,11'. In *L'Apocalypse johannique et l'Apocalyptique dans le Nouveau Testament* (ed. J. Lambrecht). Gembloux and Louvain: Duculot and Louvain University Press, 1986.

Conzelmann, E. **1 Corinthians.** *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians.* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.

Crossan, J.D. *The Historical* **Jesus**. *The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant.* Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991.

Cullmann, O. **Salvation** *in History.* London: SCM, 1967.

Daniel, J. '**Anti-Semitism** in the Hellenistic-Roman Period.' *JBL* 98 (1979), pp.45-65.

Davids, P.H. *The Epistle of* **James**. Exeter: Paternoster, 1982.

Derrett, J.D.M. **Studies** *in the New Testament.* Vols. 1-4. Leiden: Brill, 1978-1986.

—— 'Contributions to the Study of the Gerasene **Demoniac**.' *JSNT* 3 (1979), 2-27.

Devisch, M. 'Le document Q, source de **Mattieu:** problématique actuelle.' In *L'Évangile selon Mattieu: rédaction et théologie* (ed. M. Didier). Gembloux: Duculot, pp.71-98.

Dewey, J. *Markan Public* **Debate.** *Literary Technique, Concentric Structure and Theology in Mark 2:1-3:6.* Michigan: Ann Arbor, 1980.

Dibelius, M. *Die* **Formgeschichte** *des Evangeliums.* Tübingen: Mohr, 1959, 1971.

Downing, F.G. 'Towards the **Rehabilitation** of Q'. *NTS* 11 (1965), pp.169-181.

—— 'Compositional **Conventions** and the Synptic Problem.' *JBL* 107 (1988), pp.69-85.

—— 'A **Paradigm Perplex**: Luke, Matthew and Mark.' *NTS* 38 (1992), pp.15-36.

—— 'A **Genre** for Q and a Socio-Cultural Context for Q: Comparing Sets of Similarities with Sets of Differences.' *JSNT* 55 (1994), pp.3-26.

Dunn, J.D.G. **Jesus and the Spirit.** London: SCM, 1975.

—— **Unity and Diversity** *in the New Testament.* London, SCM, 1977.

—— **'Prophetic "I"-Sayings** and the Jesus Tradition: The Importance of Testing Prophetic Utterances Within Early Christianity.' *NTS* 24 (1977), pp.173-198.

—— **Christology** *in the Making. An Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation.* London: SCM, 1980.

Dupont, J. *Les trois* **apocalypses** *synoptiques. Marc 13, Matthieu 24-25, Luc 21.* Paris: Cerf, 1985.

—— '**Renoncer** à tous ses biens (Luc 14,33).' *Nouvelle revue théologique* 93 (1971), pp.561-582.

Edwards, R.A. *A* **Theology of Q***: Eschatology, Prophecy and Wisdom.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976.

Evans, C.F. *Saint* **Luke.** London: SCM, 1990.

Faierstein, M. 'Why do the Scribes say that **Elijah** Must Come First?' *JBL* 100 (1981), pp.75-86.

Farmer, W.R. *The Synoptic* **Problem***: A Critical Analysis.* Dillsboro: North Carolina Press, 1976.

Fenton, J. '**Inclusio** and Chiasmus in NT.' In *Studia Evangelica* I (ed. F. Cross). Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1959, pp.174-179.

Feuillet, A. 'La synthèse **eschatologique** de saint Matthieu (XXIV-XXV). *RevB* 56 (1949), pp.340-364.

Fitzmyer, J.A. '**Aramaic** Kepha' and Peter's name in the New Testament.' In *Donum Gentilicium. Studies in Honour of David Daube* (ed. E. Bammel). Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978, pp.121-132.

—— '**More about Elijah** coming first.' *JBL* 104 (1985), pp.295-296.

Freyne, S. *The* **Twelve***: Disciples and Apostles. A Study in the Theology of the First Three Gospels.* London and Sydney: Sheed and Ward, 1968.

Friedrich, J. '**Wortstatistik** als Methode am Beispiel der Frage einer Sonderquelle im Matthäusevangelium.' *ZNW* 76 (1985), pp.29-42.

Fuchs, A. *Die* **Entwicklung** *der Beelzebubkontroverse bei den Synoptikern.* Linz: Berger, 1980.

Gatzweiler, K. 'Les Récits de **Miracles**'. In *L'Évangile selon Matthieu: rédaction et théologie.* (ed. M. Didier). Gembloux: Duculot, 1972, pp.209-220.

Geddert, T.J. **Watchwords.** *Mark 13 in Markan Eschatology.* Sheffield: JSOT, 1988.

Gerhardsson, B. **Memory** *and Manuscript. Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity.* Lund: Gleerup, 1961.

Gonzalez, J.L. *Faith and* **Wealth**: *A History of Early Christian Ideas on the Origin, Significance and Use of Money.* San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1990.

Goulder, M. 'On **Putting Q to the Test.**' *NTS* 24 (1978), pp.218-234.

—— *The Evangelists'* **Calendar**. *A Lectionary Explanation of the Development of Scripture.* London: SPCK, 1978.

Grässer, E. *Das* **Problem** *der Parusieverzögerung in den Synoptischen Evangelien und in der Apostelgeschichte.* Berlin: Töpelmann, 1957.

Grayston, K. 'The Study of **Mark XIII.**' *BJRL* 56 (1973), pp.371-387.

—— **Dying, We Live**. London: DLT, 1993.

Green, B. 'Matthew 11,7-15. Redaction or Self-Redaction?' In *The Synoptic Gospels. Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism* (ed. C. Focant). Leuven: Peeters, 1993.

Güttgemanns, E. **Offene Fragen** zur Formgeschichte des Evangeliums. Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1970.

Hahn, F. *Das Verständnis der* **Mission** *im Neuen Testament.* Neukirchen: Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins, 1963.

—— *Christologische* **Hoheitstitel**. *Ihre Geschichte im frühen Christentum.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964[2].

Harnack, A. *The* **Sayings** *of Jesus. The Second Source of St. Matthew and St. Luke* (trans. J. Wilkinson). London: Williams & Norgate, 1908.

Harnisch, W. *Eschatologische* **Existenz**. *Ein exegetischer Beitrag zum Sachanliegen von 1.Thessalonicher 4,13-5,11.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973.

Hartin, P.J. *James and the* **Q Sayings** *of Jesus.* Sheffield: JSOT, 1991.

Hartman, L. **Testimonium Linguae**: *Participial Constructions in the Synoptic Gospels.* Lund: Gleerup, 1963.

Harvey, A.E. *Strenuous* **Commands**. *The Ethic of Jesus.* London: SCM, 1990.

Heininger, B. **Metaphorik**. *Erzählsstruktur und szenisch-dramatische Gestaltung in den Sondergleichnissen bei Lukas.* Münster: Aschendorff, 1992.

Henaut, B. **Oral Tradition** *and the Gospels: The Problem of Mark 4.* Sheffield: JSOT, 1993.

Hengel, M. *Nachfolge und* **Charisma**. *Eine exegetisch–religionsgeschichtliche Studie zu Mt 8.21f. und der Jesu Ruf in die Nachfolge.* Berlin: Töpelmann, 1968.

—— *The* **'Hellenization'** *of Judaea in the First Century after Christ.* London: SCM, 1989.

Herrenbrück, F. *Jesus und die* **Zöllner**. Tübingen: Mohr, 1990.

Hill, D. 'On the Evidence for the Creative Role of **Christian Prophets**.' *NTS* 20 (1974), pp.262-274.

—— *New Testament* **Prophecy**. London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1979.

Hoffmann, P. *Studien zur Theologie der* **Logienquelle**. Münster: Aschendorff, 1972.

Hooker, M.D. *Jesus and the* **Servant**. London: SPCK, 1959.

—— **'Review: Goulder**, M.D., *The Evangelists' Calendar.*' *EpR* 2 (1980), pp.91-93.

—— **Continuity** *and Discontinuity. Early Christianity in its Jewish Setting.* London: Epworth, 1986.

—— *The Gospel according to St* **Mark**. London: A. & C. Black, 1991.

Hull, J. *Hellenistic* **Magic** *and the Synoptic Tradition.* London: SCM, 1974.

Hunkin, J. ' **"Pleonastic"** Archomai in the New Testament.' *JTS* 25 (1924), pp.390-402.

Jeremias, J. **Weltvollender**. Gütersloh, 1930.

—— *Der* **Kindertaufe** *in den ersten vier Jahrhunderten.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958.

—— *Die* **Sprache** *des Lukas-Evangeliums. Redaktion und Tradition im Nicht-Markusstoff des dritten Evangeliums.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980.

Johnson, L.T. *The Literary Function of* **Possessions** *in Luke–Acts.* Missoula: Scholars' Press, 1977.

Jónsson, J. **Humour** *and Irony in the New Testament.* Leiden: Brill, 1985.

Joüon, P. 'Notes Philologiques sur les Évangiles.' *Recherches de science religieuse* 18 (1928), p.349.

Jüngel, R. **Paulus** *und Jesus.* Tübingen: Mohr, 1967[3].

Käsemann, E. *New Testament* **Questions** *of Today.* London: SCM, 1969.

Kearns, R. **Vorfragen** *zur Christologie. Überlieferungsgeschichtliche und rezeptionsgeschichtliche Studie zur Vorgeschichte eines christologischen Hoheitstitels.* Tübingen: Mohr (Paul Siebeck), I 1978: II 1980.

Kee, H.C. **Community** *of the New Age: Studies in Mark's Gospel.* SCM, 1977.

——— **Origins** *of Christianity. Sources and Documents.* London, SPCK, 1980.

Kelber, W.H. *The* **Oral** *and Written Tradition.* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.

Klijn, A.F.J. '**Scribes**, Pharisees, Highpriests and Elders in the New Testament.' *NovT* 3 (1959), pp.259-267.

Kloppenborg, J. (ed.) *Early Christianity,* **Q and Jesus.** *Semeia* 55. Missoula: Scholars' Press, 1992.

Koch, K. *The Growth of the Biblical* **Tradition**. The Form-Critical Method. London: A. & C. Black, 1969.

Köster, H. 'From the Kerygma-Gospel to Written **Gospels**.' NTS 35 (1989), pp.361-381.

Kuhn, K.G. 'Jesu in **Gethsemane**.' *EvT* 12 (1952), pp.260-267.

Lambrecht, J. 'Redaction and Theology in **Mk.IV**.' In *L'Évangile selon Marc* (ed. M. Sabbe). Louvain: Louvain University Press, 1971, pp.269-307.

Laufen, R. *Die* **Doppelüberlieferungen** *der Logienquelle und des Markusevangeliums.* Königstein/Bonn: P. Hanstein Verlag, 1980.

Lemcio, E.E. 'External Evidence for the **Structure** and Function of Mark iv.1-20, vii. 14-23 and viii. 14-21.' *JTS* 29 (1978), pp.323-338.

Lindars, B. *New Testament* **Apologetic**. London: SCM, 1961.

——— *Jesus* **Son of Man.** *A Fresh Examination of the Son of Man Sayings in the Gospels in the Light of Recent Research.* London: SPCK, 1983.

Lindsey, R.L. 'A Modified Two-Document Theory of the **Synoptic** Dependence and Interdependence.' *NovT* 6 (1963), pp.239-264.

Lührmann, D. *Die* **Redaktion** *der Logienquelle.* Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969.

McKelvey, R. 'Christ the **Cornerstone**.' *NTS* 8 (1961), pp.31-36.

Manson, T.W. *The* **Teaching** *of Jesus.* Cambridge: CUP, 1951.

——— *The* **Sayings** *of Jesus.* London: SCM, 1954[3].

Marshall, I.H. *The Gospel of* **Luke**. *A Commentary on the Greek Text.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.

Mason, S. *Flavius Josephus on the* **Pharisees**. *A Composition-Critical Study.* Leiden: Brill, 1991.

Mattila, S. 'Two Contrasting Eschatologies at Qumran (**4Q246** vs 1 QM).' *Bib* 75 (1994), pp.518-538.

——— 'A **Question** Too Often Neglected.' *NTS* 41 (1995), pp.199-217.

Maynard-Reid, P.U. **Poverty** *and Wealth in James.* New York: Orbis, 1987.

Mazzaferri, F.D. *The* **Genre** *of the Book of Revelation from a Source-Critical Perspective.* Berlin: De Gruyter, 1989.

Mealand, D. **Poverty** *and Eschatology in the Gospels.* London: SPCK, 1980.

Meeks, W.A. *The First* **Urban Christians**. New Haven: Yale, 1983.

Meier, J.P. '**John the Baptist** in Josephus: Philology and Exegesis.' *JBL* 111 (1992), pp.225-237.

Meyer, B.F. *The* **Aims** *of Jesus*. London: SCM, 1979.

—— 'Many (=All) are **Called**, But Few (=Not All) are Chosen.' *NTS* 36 (1990), pp.89-97.

Minear, P.S. **To Heal** *and to Reveal. The Prophetic Vocation according to Luke*. New York: Seabury Press, 1976.

Moule, C.F.D. *The* **Birth** *of the New Testament*. London: A. & C.Black, 1982[3].

—— 'The **Function** of the Synoptic Gospels.' In *Glaube und Eschatologie. Festschrift für Werner Georg Kümmel zum 80. Gerburtstag* (edd. E. Grässer & O. Merk). Tübingen: Mohr, 1985, pp.199-208.

Mueller, J. 'The Temple Scroll and the Gospel **Divorce** Texts.' *RevQ* 38 (1980), pp.255-256.

Muraoka, T. 'The **use** of ΩΣ in the Greek Bible.' *NovT* 7 (1964), pp.51-72.

Mussner, F. *Christus,* **das All** *und die Kirche*. Tier: Paulus, 1968.

Neirynck, F. *Jésus aux origines de la* **tradition**. *Matériaux pour l'histoire évangélique*. Brugge, 1968.

—— **Duality** *in Mark: Contribution to the Study of the Markan Redaction*. Louvain: Leuven, 1972.

—— *The* **Minor Agreements** *of Matthew and Luke against Mark with a Cumulative List*. Louvain: Leuven, 1974.

—— 'Recent Developments in the Study of Q.' In **Logia.** *Les paroles de Jésus—The Sayings of Jesus* (ed. J. Delobel) Leuven: Peeters, 1982.

—— *New Testament* **Vocabulary**. *A Companion Volume to the Concordance*. Leuven: Peeters, 1984.

Neusner, J. 'First **Cleanse the Inside**.' *NTS* 22 (1976), pp.486-495.

Pesch, R. 'Zur **Exegese** von Mt 6,19-21 und Lk 12,33-34.' *Bib* 41 (1960), pp.356-378.

—— '**Eschatologie** und Ethik. Auslegung von Mt 24,1-36.' *Bibel und Leben* 11 (1970), pp.224-227.

—— 'The Position and Significance of **Peter** in the Church of the New Testament.' *Concilium* 7,4 (1971), pp.21-25.

—— *Das* **Markusevangelium**. *Einleitung und Kommentar*. Freiburg: Herder, 1977[2].

Piper, J. '**Love your enemies**.' *Jesus' Love Command in the Synoptic Gospels and the Early Christian Paraenesis*. Cambridge: CUP, 1979.

—— **Wisdom** *in the Q-Tradition. The Aphoristic Teaching of Jesus*. Cambridge: CUP, 1989.

Pryke, E. **Redactional Style** *in the Marcan Gospel*. Cambridge: CUP, 1978.

Rehkopf, F. *Die lukanische* **Sonderquelle**: *Ihr Umfang und Sprachgebrauch*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1959.

Reiser, M. *Die* **Gerichtspredigt** *Jesu. Eine Untersuchung zur eschatologischen Verkündigung Jesu und ihrem frühjüdischen Hintergrund*. Münster: Aschendorff, 1994.

Robinson, J.A.T. *Jesus and His* **Coming**: *The Emergence of a Doctrine.* London: SCM, 1957.

—— 'The **Baptism of John** and the Qumran Community.' In *Twelve New Testament Studies.* London: SCM, 1962, pp.11-28.

—— '**Elijah**, John and Jesus.' In *Twelve New Testament Studies.* London: SCM, 1962, pp.28-52.

Robinson, J.M. '**Logoi Sophon**. Zur Gattung der Spruchquelle Q.' In *Zeit und Geschichte. Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann zum 80. Geburtstag* (ed. E. Dinkler). Tübingen: Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1964, pp.77-96.

Rochais, G. *Les récits de* **résurrection** *des morts dans le Nouveau Testament.* Cambridge: CUP, 1981.

Rohde, J. *Rediscovering the* **Teaching** *of the Evangelists.* London: SCM, 1968.

Rydbeck, L. **Fachprosa**, *Vermeintliche Volkssprache und Neues Testament.* Uppsala: Berlingska Boktryckeriet, 1967.

Sanders, E.P. 'The Argument from **Order** and the Relationship between Matthew and Luke.' *NTS* 15 (1968-69), pp.249-261.

—— *The Tendencies of the* **Synoptic Tradition**. Cambridge: CUP, 1969.

—— 'The **Overlaps** of Mark and Q and the Synoptic Problem.' *NTS* 19 (1972-73), pp.453-465.

—— *Paul and Palestinian* **Judaism**. *A Comparison of Patterns of Religion.* London: SCM, 1977.

—— *The* **Historical** *Figure of Jesus.* London: Allen Lane, 1993.

Sanders, E.P. & Davies, M. *Studying the* **Synoptic Gospels**. London: SCM, 1989.

Sanders, J.A. '**From Isaiah 61** to Luke 4.' In *Christianity, Judaism and Other Graeco-Roman Cults. Studies for Morton Smith at sixty* (ed. J. Neusner). Leiden: Brill, 1975, pp.75-83.

Schmidt, D. 'The LXX Gattung "Prophetic **Correlative**".' *JBL* 96 (1977), pp.517-530.

Schramm, T. *Der* **Markus-Stoff** *bei Lukas.* Cambridge: CUP, 1971.

Schulz, S. **'Q'**. *Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten.* Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1972.

Schürmann, H. *Jesu* **Abschiedsrede**. Münster: Aschendorff, 1957.

—— 'Sprachliche **Reminiszenzen** an abgeänderte oder ausgelassene Bestandteile.' In H Schürmann, *Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den Synoptischen Evangelien.* Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1968, pp.111-125.

—— *Das* **Lukasevengelium**. Freiburg: Herder, 1969.

Schüssler-Fiorenza, E. '**Judging** and Judgement in the New Testament Communities.' *Concilium* 107 (1977), pp.1-8.

Schweizer, E. 'Der Menschensohn. (Zur eschatologischen **Erwartung** Jesu).' *ZNW* 50 (1959), pp.185-209.

Slater, T. '"One like a Son of Man" in First-Century CE Judaism.' *NTS* 41 (1995), pp.183-198.

Snodgrass, K. 'Western **Non-Interpolations**.' *JBL* 91 (1972), pp.369-379.

Stacey, W.D. 'The **Lord's Supper** as Prophetic Drama.' *EpR* 21 (1994), pp.65-74.

Stanton, G.N. 'On the **Christology** of "Q".' In *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament. In honour of Charles Francis Digby Moule* (edd. B. Lindars & S. Smalley). Cambridge: CUP, 1973, pp.27-42.

—— **Jesus** *of Nazareth in New Testament Preaching*. Cambridge: CUP, 1974.

Streeter, B.H. *The Four Gospels. A Study of Origins*. London, 1930.

Sweet, J. **Revelation**. London: SCM, 1979.

Syreeni, K. 'Between Heaven and Earth: On the Structure of Matthew's **Symbolic Universe**.' *JSNT* 40 (1990), pp.3-13.

Theissen, G. '**Wanderradikalismus**. Literatursoziologische Aspekt der Überlieferung von Worten Jesu im Urchristentum'. *ZTK* 70 (1973), pp.245-271.

—— 'Legitimation und Lebensunterhalt: Ein Beitrag zur **Soziologie** urchristlicher Missionare.' *NTS* 21 (1975), pp.192-221.

—— *Studien zur* **Soziologie des Urchristentums**. Tübingen: Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1979.

—— **Miracle Stories** *of the Early Christian Tradition*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1983.

—— **Lokalkolorit** *und Zeitgeschichte in den Evangelien*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989.

Thrall, M. *Greek* **Particles** *in the New Testament, Linguistic and Exegetical Studies*. Leiden: Brill, 1962.

Tödt, H.E. *Der* **Menschensohn** *in der synoptischen Überlieferung*. Gütersloh, 1959.

Tuckett, C.M. *The Revival of the* **Griesbach** *Hypothesis: An Analysis and Appraisal*. Cambridge: CUP, 1983.

—— 'Response to the **Q** Seminar.' In *Early Christianity, Q and Jesus. Semeia* 55. Atlanta: SBL, 1992, pp.213-222.

—— 'On the Stratification of Q. A Response.' In *Early Christianity, Q and Jesus. Semeia* 55 Atlanta: SBL, 1992, pp.213-222.

—— (ed.) *Synoptic* **Studies**. *The Ampleforth Conferences of 1982 & 1983*. Sheffield: JSOT, 1984.

Turner, C.H. 'Ο ΨΙΟΣ ΜΟΥ Ο **ΑΓΑΠΗΤΟΣ**..' *JTS* 27 (1926), pp.113-129.

van Iersel, B.M.F. '**Der Sohn**' *in den synoptischen Jesusworten*. Leiden: Brill, 1961.

van Roon, A. *The Authenticity of* **Ephesians** (trans. S. Prescod-Jokel). Leiden: Brill, 1974.

van der Kwaak, H. 'Die **Klage** über Jerusalem (Matth. xxiii 37-39).' *NovT* 8 (1966), pp.156-170.

Vassiliadis, P. 'The Nature and Extent of the **Q**-Document.' *NovT* 20 (1968), pp.49-72.

Vencovský, J. 'Der gadarenische Exorcismus (Mt 8,28-34 und Parallelen)'. *Communio Viatorum* 14 (1971), pp.17-29.

Vischer, L. *Die* **Auslegungsgeschichte** *von I. Kor. 6,1-11.* Tübingen: Mohr, 1955.

Vögtle, A. *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien.* **Beiträge** *zur Evangelienforschung.* Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1971.

von Gemünden, P. **Vegetationsmetaphorik** *im Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt. Eine Bildfelduntersuchung.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992.

Walcot, P. **Envy** *among the Greeks.* London, 1959.

Weiß, J. *Das Matthäusevangelium.* Göttingen, 1907[2].

Wilch, J.R. **Time** *and Event.* Leiden: Brill, 1969.

Wilder, A.N. 'Eschatological **Imagery** and Earthly Circumstance.' *NTS* 5 (1959), pp.229-245.

Williams, J.G. **Gospel** *against Parable: Mark's Language of Mystery.* Sheffield: JSOT, 1985.

Winton, A.P. *The* **Proverbs** *of Jesus. Issues of History and Rhetoric.* Sheffield: JSOT, 1990.

Wood, J.E. '**Isaac** Typology in the New Testament.' *NTS* 14 (1967), pp.585-589.

Wright, N.T. *The Climax of the* **Covenant***: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology.* Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991.

—— *The New Testament and the* **People** *of God.* Vol. I. London: SPCK, 1992.

Yates, J.E. *The* **Spirit** *and the Kingdom.* London: SPCK, 1963.

Zeller, D. '**Redaktions**prozesse und wechselnder «Sitz im Leben» beim Q-Material.' In *Logia: Les Paroles de Jésus* (ed. J. Delobel). Leuven: Peeters, 1982.

4. *PARABLES—GENERAL LITERATURE*

Arens, E, *Kommunikative Handlungen. Die paradigmatische Bedeutung der* **Gleichnisse** *Jesu für eine Handlungstheorie.* Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1982.

—— 'Metaphorische Erzählungen und **kommunikative Handlungen** Jesu. Zum Ansatz einer Gleichnistheorie.' *BZ* N.F. 32 (1988), pp.52-71.

Almeida, Y. **L'opérativité** *sémantique des récits-paraboles.* Louvain: Peeters, 1978.

Aurelio, T. **Disclosures** *in den Gleichnissen Jesu.* Frankfurt: Lang, 1977.

Bacon, B. 'The Matthean Discourses in **Parables**, Mt. 13:1-52.' *JBL* 46 (1927), pp.237-265.

Baasland, E. 'Zum Beispiel der Beispielerzählungen. Zur **Formenlehre** der Gleichnisse und zur Methodik der Gleichnisauslegung.' *NovT* 28 (1986), pp.193-219.

Bailey, K. E. **Poet and Peasant**: *A Literary-Cultural Approach to the Parables in Luke.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976.

—— 'Study of Some **Lucan Parables** in the Light of Oriental Life and Poetic Style.' Unpublished Thesis. Concordia Seminary, 1972.

Baird, J. 'A Pragmatic Approach to Parable Exegesis: Some New Evidence on **Mark 4:11, 33-34**.' *JBL* 76 (1957), pp.201-207.

Bauckham, R. 'Synoptic **Parousia** Parables and the Apocalypse.' *NTS* 23 (1976-77), pp.162-176.

Berger, K. '**Materialien** zu Form und Überlieferungsgeschichte neutestamentlicher Gleichnisse.' *NovT* 15 (1973), pp.1-37.

—— 'Zur Frage des traditionsgeschichtlichen Wertes apokrypher **Gleichnisse**.' *NovT* 17 (1975), pp.58-76.

Biser, E. *Die* **Gleichnisse** *Jesu*. Munich: Kösel, 1965.

Black, M. 'The **Parables** as Allegory.' *BJRL* 42 (1960), pp.273-287.

Boobyer, G. 'The Redaction of **Mark IV, 1-34**.' *NTS* 7 (1961), pp.59-70.

Boucher, M. *The* **Mysterious** *Parable: A Literary Study*. Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1977.

Bowker, J. '**Mystery** and Parable.' *JTS* 25 (1974), pp.300-317.

Briscoe, H. 'A Comparison of the Parables in the Gospel According to **Thomas** and the Synoptic Gospels.' Unpublished Thesis. Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1966.

Brown, R.E. '**Parable** and Allegory Reconsidered.' *NovT* 5 (1962), pp.36-45.

Bugge, C. *Die* **Haupt-Parabeln** *Jesu*. Giessen: J. Ricker, 1903.

Buzy, D. *Introduction aux* **paraboles** *évangéliques*. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1912.

—— 'Les **sentences** finales des paraboles évangéliques.' *RevB* 40 (1931), pp.321-344.

Caird, G.B. *The Language and* **Imagery** *of the Bible*. London: Duckworth, 1980.

Carlston, C. E. *The Parables of the* **Triple Tradition**. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.

—— 'Reminiscence and **Redaction** in Lk 15.11-32.' *JBL* 94 (1975), pp.368-390.

Cave, C.H. 'The **Parables** and the Scriptures.' *NTS* 11 (1965), pp.374-387.

Cerfaux, L. '**La connaissance** des secrets du Royaume d'après Matt. xiii.11 et par.' *NTS* 2 (1955-56), pp.238-249.

Crossan, J.D. 'Parable and **Example** in the Teaching of Jesus.' *NTS* 18 (1971-72), pp.285-307.

—— **In Parables**: The Challenge of the Historical Jesus. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.

—— 'The **Seed** Parables of Jesus.' *JBL* 92 (1973), pp.244-266.

—— 'The **Servant** Parables of Jesus.' *Semeia* 1 (1974), pp.17-62.

—— '**Structuralist Analysis** and the Parables of Jesus'. A Reply to D.O. Via, Jr., 'Parable and Example Story: A Literary-Structuralist Approach.' *Semeia* 1 (1974), pp.192-221.

—— 'A Basic **Bibliography** for Parables Research.' *Semeia* 1 (1974), pp.236-274.

—— *Raid on the* **Articulate**: *Comic Eschatology in Jesus and Borges*. New York: Harper & Row, 1976.

Dahl, N. 'The **Parables** of Growth.' *ST* 5 (1951), pp.132-166.

—— '**Gleichnis** und Parabel.' In *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart: Handwörterbuch für Theologie und Religionswissenschaft*, 3. Aufl. Tübingen: Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1957-65. 6 Vols. Vol. 2 (ed. K. Galling), Sp.1614-1619.

Derrett, J. **Law** *in the New Testament*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1970.

—— **Studies** *in the New Testament*. Vols. I–III, Leiden: Brill, 1979-1982.

Dillon, R.J. 'Towards a Tradition-History of the Parables of the True **Israel** (Mt. 21:33-22:14).' *Bib* 47 (1966), pp.1-42.

Dodd, C. H. *The* **Parables** *of the Kingdom*. London: Nisbet, 1935.

Doty, W. 'The Parables of Jesus, Kafka, Borges and Others, with Structural Observations.' *Semeia* 2 (1974), pp.152-193.

Drögmüller, H.P. 'Die **Gleichnisse** im hellenistischen Epos'. Unpublished Thesis. Hamburg, 1956.

Drury, J. '**The Sower**, the Vineyard, and the Place of Allegory in the Interpretation of Mark's Parables'. *JTS* 24 (1974), pp.367-379.

—— *The* **Parables** *in the Gospels: History and Allegory*. New York: Crossroads, 1985.

Dschulnigg, P. *Rabbinische* **Gleichnisse** *und das Neue Testament: Die Gleichnisse d. PesK im Vergleich mit den Gleichnissen Jesu und dem Neuen Testament*. Bern: Lang, 1988.

—— 'Gleichnis vom **Kind**, das zum Vater flieht.' *ZNW* 81 (1990), pp.269-271.

Dupont, J. '**Le point de vue** de Mt. dans le chapitre des paraboles.' In *L'Évangile selon Matthieu: rédaction et théologie* (ed. M. Didier). Gembloux: Duculot, 1972, pp.159-221.

Eichholz, G. **Einführung** *in die Gleichnisse*. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1963.

—— **Gleichnisse** *der Evangelien. Form, Überlieferung, Auslegung*. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1971.

Erlemann, K. *Das* **Gottesbild** *der synoptischen Gleichnisse*. Doctoral Thesis presented to the University of Heidelberg, 1966.

—— *Das Bild Gottes in den synoptischen* **Gleichnissen**. Stuttgart, 1988.

Feldman, A. *The* **Parables** *and Similes of the Rabbis*. Cambridge: CUP, 1924.

Fiebig, P. *Altjüdische* **Gleichnisse** *und die Gleichnisse Jesu*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1904.

—— *Die* **Gleichnisreden** *Jesu im Lichte der rabbinischen Gleichnisse des neutestamentlichen Zeitalters. Ein Beitrag zum Streit um die 'Christusmythe' und eine Widerlegung der Gleichnistheorie Jülichers.* Tübingen: Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1912.

—— *Der* **Erzählungsstil** *der Evangelien im Lichte des rabbinischen Erzählungsstils untersucht, zugleich ein Beitrag zum Streit um die 'Christusmythe'.* Leipzig: Mohr, 1925.

Findlay, J.A. *Jesus and His* **Parables**. London: Epworth, 1950.

Flusser, D. *Die rabbinischen* **Gleichnisse** *und der Gleichniserzähler Jesu.* 1. Teil. *Das Wesen der Gleichnisse.* Bern: Lang, 1981.

Funk, R. '**Structure** in the Narrative Parables of Jesus.' *Semeia* 2 (1974), pp.51-73.

—— 'The Narrative **Parables**: The Birth of a Language Tradition.' In *God's Christ and his People. Studies in honour of N.A. Dahl* (edd. J. Jervell & W. Meeks). Oslo–Bergen: Universitetsforlaget, 1977, pp.43-50.

Gerhardsson, B. 'The **Seven** Parables in Matthew 13' (trans. J. Toy). *NTS* 19 (1972), pp.16-37.

Gnilka, J. 'Das **Verstockungsproblem** nach Matthäus 13, 13-15.' In *Antijudaismus im Neuen Testament? Exegetische und systematische Beiträge* (edd. W. Eckert et al.). Munich: Kaiser, 1967, pp.119-128.

Goulder, M.D. '**Characteristics** of the Parables in the Several Gospels.' *JTS* 19 (1968), pp.51-69.

Güttgemanns, E. 'Die linguistisch-didaktische **Methodik** der Gleichnisse Jesu.' In E. Güttgemanns, *Studia Linguistica Neotestamentica.* Munich: Kaiser, 1971, pp.99-183.

—— 'Narrative **Analysis** of Synoptic Texts.' *Semeia* 6 (1976), pp.127-179.

Haenchen, E. *Apostelgeschichte.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959.

—— *Die Botschaft des* **Thomas**-*Evangeliums.* Berlin: Töpelmann, 1961.

Harnisch, W. 'Die **Ironie** als Stilmittel in Gleichnissen Jesu.' *EvT* 32 (1972), pp.421-436.

—— 'Die **Sprachkraft** der Analogie: Zur These vom "argumentativen Charakter" der Gleichnisse Jesu.' *ST* 28 (1974), pp.1-20.

—— 'Die **Metaphor** als heuristiches Prinzip.' *Verkündigung und Forschung* 24 (1979), pp.53-89.

Hedrick, C. *Parables as Poetic* **Fictions**. *The Creative Voice of Jesus.* Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994.

Hermaniuk, M. *La* **parabole** *évangélique.* Paris: Desclée, 1947.

Hunter, A.M. *Interpreting the* **Parables**. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960.

Hunzinger, D.-H. '**Unbekannte** Gleichnisse Jesu aus dem Thomas-Evangelium.' In *Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche. Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias* (ed. W. Eltester). Berlin: Töpelmann, 1960, pp.209-220.

Jeremias, J. *The* **Parables** *of Jesus* (trans. S.H. Hooke from the 1962[6] edition of *Die Gleichnisse Jesu*). London: SCM Press, 1963.

—— 'Tradition und Redaktion in **Lukas 15**.' *ZNW* 62 (1971), pp.172-189.

Johnson, S.E. '**King Parables** in the Synoptic Gospels.' *JBL* 74 (1955), pp.37-39.

Johnston, R.M. 'The Study of Rabbinic **Parables**: Some Preliminary Observations.' In *SBL* 1976 Seminar Papers (ed. G. MacRae). Missoula: Scholars' Press, 1976, pp.337-357.

Jones, G.V. *The* **Art** *and Truth of the Parables: A Study in Their Literary Form and Modern Interpretation.* London: SPCK, 1964.

Jörns, K.P. 'Die **Gleichnisverkündigung** Jesu: Reden von Gott als Wort Gottes.' In *Der Ruf Jesu und die Antwort der Gemeinde. Exegetische Untersuchungen Joachim Jeremias zum 80. Geburtstag gewidmet von seinen Schülern* (edd. E. Lohse, C. Burchard & B. Schaller). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970, pp.157-178.

Jülicher, A. *Die* **Gleichnisreden** *Jesu.* Freiburg: Mohr, Teil 1 1888; Teil 2 1899.

Kermode, F. *The* **Genesis** *of Secrecy. On the Interpretation of Narrative.* London: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Kingsbury, J. D. *The* **Parables** *of Jesus in Matthew 13: A Study in Redaction-Criticism.* London: SPCK, 1969.

Kirkland, J.R. 'The Earliest Understanding of Jesus' Use of **Parables**: Mark 4:10-12 in Context.' *NovT* 19 (1977), pp.1-21.

Kissinger, W.S. *The* **Parables** *of Jesus: A History of Interpretation and Bibliography.* ATLA Bibliography Series 4, 1979.

Kjärgaard, M.S. **Metaphor** *and Parable. A Systematic Analysis of the Specific Structure and Cognitive Function of the Synoptic Similes and Parables qua Metaphors.* Leiden: Brill, 1986.

Klauck, H.-J. '**Neue Beiträge** zur Gleichnisforschung.' *Bibel und Leben* 13 (1972), pp.214-230.

—— **Allegorie** *und Allegorese in synoptischen Gleichnistexten.* Münster: Aschendorff, 1978, 1985[2].

Klemm, H. G. 'Die Gleichnisauslegung Adolf Jülichers im Bannkreis der **Fabeltheorie** Lessings.' *ZNW* 60 (1969), pp.153-174.

Kümmel, W.G. **Promise** *and Fulfilment.* London: SCM, 1961.

Ladd, G.E. 'The Life-setting of the **Parables** of the Kingdom.' *Journal of Bible and Religion* 31 (1963), pp.193-199.

——— 'The **Sitz im Leben** of the Parables of Matthew 13: The Soils.' In *Studia Evangelica* II (ed. F. Cross). Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1964, pp.203-210.

Lagrange, M.J. '**Le but** des paraboles d'après l'Évangile selon Saint Marc.' *RevB* N.S. 7 (1910), pp.5-35.

Lambrecht, J. **Once More Astonished.** *The Parables of Jesus.* New York: Crossroads, 1981.

Lindars, B. 'Two **Parables** in John.' *NTS* 16 (1970), pp.318-329.

Lindemann, A. 'Zur Gleichnisinterpretation im **Thomas**-Evangelium.' *ZNW* 71 (1980), pp.214-243.

Linnemann, E. **Parables** of Jesus: Introduction and Exposition. London: SPCK, 1966.

——— **Gleichnisse** *Jesu. Einführung und Auslegung.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975.

Madsen, I.K. *Die* **Parabeln** *der Evangelien und die heutige Psychologie.* Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1936.

Magass, W. 'Zur **Semiotik** der signifikanten Orte in der Gleichnisse Jesu.' *Linguistica Biblica* 15 (1972), pp.3-21.

Marcus, J. 'Mark 4:10-12 and Marcan **Epistemology**.' *JBL* 103 (1984), pp.557-574.

Marshall, I.H. **Eschatology** *and the Parables.* London: Tyndale Press, 1963.

Martin, H. *The* **Parables** *of the Gospels and their Meaning for Today.* London: SCM, 1937.

Meinertz, M. *Die* **Gleichnisse** *Jesu.* Münster: Aschendorff, 1948[3].

Montefiore, H. 'A Comparison of the Parables of the Gospel According to **Thomas** and of the Synoptic Gospels.' *NTS* 7 (1961), pp.220-248.

Morgenthaler, R. '**Formgeschichte** und Gleichnisauslegung.' *TZ* 6 (1950), pp.1-16.

Moule, C.F.D. 'The **Use of Parables** and Sayings as Illustrative Material in early Christian Catechesis'. *JTS* 3 (1952), pp.75-79.

Oesterley, W.O.E. *The Gospel* **Parables** *in the Light of their Jewish Background.* London: SPCK, 1936.

Patte, D. (ed.) **Semiology** *and Parables: Exploration of the Possibilities Offered by Structuralism for Exegesis.* Pittsburgh: Pickwick Press, 1976.

Payne, P. 'Metaphor as a Model for **Interpretation** of the Parables of Jesus with Special Reference to the Parable of the Sower.' Unpublished Thesis. Cambridge: 1975.

Perrin, N. '**Biblical Scholarship** in a New Vein.' Review of Dan O. Via., Jr., 'The Parables: Their Literary and Existential Dimension.' *Interpretation* 21 (1967), pp.465-469.

——— 'The Modern Interpretation of the Parables of Jesus and the **Problem of Hermeneutics**.' *Interpretation* 25 (1971), pp.131-148.

——— *Jesus and the* **Language of the Kingdom***: Symbol and Metaphor in New Testament Interpretation.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976.

Petzoldt, M. **Gleichnisse** *Jesu und christliche Dogmatik*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984.

Pöhlmann, W. 'Die **Abschichtung** des Verlorenen Sohnes (Lk 15.12f.) und die erzählte Welt der Parabel.' *ZNW* 70 (1979), pp.194-213.

Pryor, J.W. 'Markan Parable Theology: An **Inquiry** into Mark's Principles of Redaction.' *ET* 83 (1972), pp.242-245.

Ragaz, L. *Die* **Gleichnisse** *Jesu. Seine soziale Botschaft*. Bern: Lang, 1944.

Räisänen, H. *Die* **Parabeltheorie** *im Markusevangelium*. Leiden: Brill, 1973.

Ricoeur, Paul. 'Biblical **Hermeneutics**.' *Semeia* 4 (1975), pp.29-148.

Riches, J. 'Parables and the Search for a New **Community**.' In *The Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism* (edd. J. Neusner et al.). Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988, pp.235-263.

Riesenfeld, H. 'The **Parables** in the Synoptic and the Johannine Traditions.' *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* 25 (1960), pp.37-61.

Robinson, J.A.T. 'Parable of **John 10:1-5**.' *ZNW* 46 (1955), pp.233-240.

Scott, B.B. *Hear then the* **Parable**. *A Commentary on the Parables of Jesus*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.

Sellew, P. '**Interior Monologue** as a Narrative Device in the Parables of Luke.' *JBL* 111 (1992), pp.235-253.

Sellin, G. '**Gleichnisstrukturen**.' *Linguistica Biblica* 31 (1974), pp.89-115.

Sheppard, J. B. 'A Study of the Parables Common to the Synoptic Gospels and the Coptic Gospel of **Thomas**.' Unpublished Thesis. Emory, 1965.

Sider, J.W. 'The Meaning of **Parabole** in the Usage of the Synoptic Evangelists.' *Bib* 62 (1981), pp.453-470.

—— 'Rediscovering the Parables: The **Logic** of the Jeremias Tradition.' *JBL* 102 (1983), pp.61-83.

—— 'Proportional **Analogy** in the Gospel Parables.' *NTS* 31 (1985), pp.1-23.

Stein, R.H. *An* **Introduction** *to the Parables of Jesus*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1981.

Steinhauser, M.G. **Doppelbildworte** *in den Synoptischen Evangelien: Eine form- und traditionskritische Studie*. Würzburg: Echter, 1981.

Swaeles, R. 'L'orientation ecclésiastique de saint Matthieu. Analyse de trois paraboles: Mt. 21, 33-46; 22, 1-14; 13, 24-30, 36-43.' Unpublished Thesis. Louvain, 1959.

Tannehill, R. 'Comments on the Articles of Daniel Patte and John Dominic Crossan.' *Semeia* 2 (1974), pp.113-116.

Thiselton, A.C. 'Parables as **Language Event**. Some Comments on Fuchs' Hermeneutics in the Light of Linguistic Philosophy.' *SJT* 23 (1970), pp.437-468.

Thoma, C. & Lauer, S. *Die* **Gleichnisse** *der Rabbinen*. Erster Teil: *Pesiqta de Rav Kahana*. Bern: Lang, 1986.

Thoma, C. & Wyschogrod, M. **Parable** *and Story in Judaism and Christianity*. New York: Paulist Press, 1989.

Tinsley, E.J. 'Parable, Allegory and Mysticism.' In *Vindications: Essays on the Historical Basis of Christianity* (ed. A. Hanson). London: SCM, 1966, pp.153-192.

Tolbert, M.A. **Perspectives** *on the Parables. An Approach to Multiple Interpretations*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978.

Trocmé, É. 'Why Parables? A Study of Mark IV.' *BJRL* 59 (1977), pp.458-471.

Tuckett, C.M. 'Mark's Concerns in the **Parables** Chapter.' *Bib* 69 (1988), pp.8-26.

Van Elderen, B. 'The Purpose of the Parables According to **Matthew 13:1-17**.' In *New Dimensions in New Testament Study* (edd. R. Longenecker & M. Tenney). Michigan: Zondervan, 1974, pp.180-190.

Via, Dan O., Jr. '**Matthew** on the Understandability of the Parables.' *JBL* 84 (1965), pp.430-432.

—— *The* **Parables***: Their Literary and Existential Dimension*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.

—— 'Parable and **Example** Story: A Literary-Structuralist Approach.' *Semeia* 1 (1974), pp.105-133.

—— 'A **Response** to Crossan, Funk and Petersen.' *Semeia* 1 (1974), pp.222-235.

—— **Kerygma** *and Comedy in the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.

Vincent, J.J. 'The Parables of Jesus as **Self-Revelation**.' In *Studia Evangelica* I (ed. F. Cross). Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1959, pp.79-99.

Weder, H. *Die* **Gleichnisse** *Jesu als Metaphern: Traditions- und redaktionsgeschichtliche Analysen und Interpretationen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978.

Weiser, A. *Die* **Knechtsgleichnisse** *der Synoptischen Evangelien*. Munich: Kösel, 1971.

Westermann, C. *Vergleiche und* **Gleichnisse** *im Alten und Neuen Testament*. Stuttgart: Calwer, 1984.

Wilder, A.N. 'Eschatological **Imagery** and Earthly Circumstances.' *NTS* 5 (1959), pp.229-245.

—— '**Eschatology** and the Speech Modes of the Gospel.' In *Zeit und Geschichte. Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann zum 80. Geburtstag* (ed. E. Dinkler). Tübingen: Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1964, pp.19-30.

—— *Jesus' Parables and the War of* **Myths**. *Essays on Imagination in the Scriptures*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.

Wiles, M.F. '**Early Exegesis** of the Parables (in the ante-Nicene Fathers).' *SJT* 11 (1958), pp.287-301.

Wilson, R.McL. *Studies in the Gospel of* **Thomas**. London: Mowbray, 1960.

—— 'Thomas and the **Synoptic Gospels**.' *ExpTim* 72 (1960-61), pp.36-39.

—— 'Thomas and the **Growth** of the Gospels.' *HTR* 53 (1960), pp.231-250.

Young, B.H. *Jesus and his Jewish* **Parables**. *Rediscovering the Roots of Jesus' Teaching.* New York: Paulist Press, 1989.

5. *THE MATTHEAN PARABLES*

THE TWO HOUSES

Abou-Chaar, K. 'The Two **Builders**: A Study of the Parable in Luke 6:47-49.' *Near Eastern School of Theology Theological Review* 5 (1982) pp.44-58.

Betz, O. '**Felsenmann** und Felsengemeinde.' *ZNW* 48 (1957), pp.70-75.

Nestle, E. '**Matt. VII, 25, 27.**' *ExpTim* 19 (1907-08), pp.237-238.

Pesch R. & Kratz, R. 'Auf **Fels** oder auf Sand gebaut?' In *So liest man synoptisch: Anleitung und Kommentar zum Studien der Synoptischen Evangelien*, Vol. 5. Frankfurt: Knecht, 1978, pp.25-37.

Wilson, James P. 'In Matthew VII, 25 is προσέπεσαν a **Primitive Error** Displacing προσέκοψαν?' *ExpTim* 57 (1945-46), p.138.

THE HOUSEHOLDER

Betz, H.D. '**Neues et Altes** im Geschichtshandeln Gottes. Bemerkungen zu Matthaus 13, 51f.' In *Das Wort Gottes in der Zeit. Festschrift Karl Hermann Schelkle zum 65. Geburtstag* (edd. H. Feld & J. Nolte). Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1973, pp.69-84.

Dupont, J. '**Nova et Vetera** (Mt 13,52).' In *L'Évangile, hier et aujourd'hui.* Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1968, pp.55-63.

Kremer, J. ' "**Neues und Altes**": Jesu Wort über den christlichen Schriftgelehrten (Mt 13,52).' In *Neues und Altes* (edd. J. Kremer et al.) Freiburg: Herder, 1974, pp.11-33.

Orton, D. *The Understanding* **Scribe**. Sheffield: SJOT, 1987.

Schnackenburg, R. ' "Jeder Schriftgelehrte, der ein Jünger des Himmelreichs geworden ist" (Mt 13,52).' In *Wissenschaft und Kirche* (edd. E. Lohse et al.). Bielefeld: Luther, 1989, pp.57-69.

Zeller, D. 'Zu einer jüdischen Vorlage von **Mt. 13:52**.' *BZ* N.F. 20 (1976), pp.223-226.

THE UNMERCIFUL SERVANT

Breukelman, F. 'Eine Erklärung des Gleichnisses vom **Schalksknecht** (Mt. 18, 23-35).' In *Parrhesia. Karl Barth zum achtzigsten Geburtstag am 10. Mai 1966.* Zürich: Gotthelf, 1966, pp.261-287.

Broer, I. 'Die Parabel vom **Versicht** auf das Prinzip von Leistung und Gegenleistung.' In J. Dupont, *À cause de l'Évangile.* Paris: Cerf, 1985, pp.145-164.

De Boer, M. 'Ten Thousand Talents? Matthew's Interpretation and Redaction of the Parable of the **Unforgiving Servant** (Matt 18:23-35).' *CBQ* 50 (1988), pp.214-232.

Deidun, T. 'The Parable of the Unmerciful Servant (Mt 18:23-35).' *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 6 (1976), pp.203-224.

Derrett, J. 'The Parable of the **Unmerciful Servant**.' In J.D.M. Derrett, *Law in the New Testament.* London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1970, pp.32-47.

Dietzfelbinger, C. 'Das Gleichnis von der erlassenen **Schuld**. Eine theologische Untersuchung von Matthäus 18, 23-35.' *EvT* 32 (1972), pp.437-451.

Fuchs, E. 'The Parable of the Unmerciful Servant. (**Matt. 18,23-35**).' *Studia Evangelica* I (ed. F. Cross). Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1959, pp.487-494.

Scott, B. 'The King's Accounting: Matthew 18:23-34.' *JBL* 104 (1985), pp.429-442.

THE SHEEP AND THE GOATS

Black, M. 'The "Parables" of **Enoch** (1 En.37-71) and the "Son of Man".' *ExpTim* 88 (1976-77), pp.5-8.

Bligh, P.H. 'Eternal Fire, Eternal Punishment, Eternal Life (**Mt 25:41, 46**).' *ExpTim* 83 (1971), pp.9-11.

Brandenburger, E. *Das* **Recht** *des Weltenrichters. Untersuchung zu Matthäus 25,31-46.* Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1980.

Brändle, R. **Matth. 25. 31-46** *im Werk des Johannes Chrysostomos.* Tübingen: Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1979.

Brandt, W. '**Die geringsten Brüder**. (Aus dem Gespräch der Kirche mit Matthäus 25, 31-46).' *Jahrbuch der Theologischen Schule Bethel* 8 (1937), pp.1-28.

Broer, I. 'Das **Gericht** des Menschensohnes über die Völker.' *Bibel und Leben* 11 (1970), pp.273-295.

Burney, C.F. '**St Matthew XXV, 31-46** as a Hebrew Poem.' *JTS* 14 (1912-13), pp.414-424.

Catchpole, D.R. 'The **Poor on Earth** and The Son of Man in Heaven. A Re-appraisal of Matthew xxv. 31-46.' *BJRL* 61 (1979), pp.355-397.

Christian, P. *Jesus und seine geringsten Brüder*: **Mt.25, 31-46** *redaktionsgeschichtlich untersucht.* Leipzig: St.Benno, 1975.

Cope, L. '**Matthew 25: 31-46**, "The Sheep and the Goats" Reinterpreted.' *NovT* 11 (1969), pp.32-44.

Court, J. '**Right and Left**: the Implications for Matthew 25.31-46.' *NTS* 31 (1985) pp.223-233.

Cranfield, C.E.D. '**Diakonia**. Matthew 25, 31-46.' *London Quarterly & Holborn Review* 30 (1961), pp.275-281.

Donahue, J. 'The "Parables" of the Sheep and the Goats: A Challenge to Christian **Ethics**.' *Theologische Studien* 47 (1986), pp.3-31.

Feuillet, A. 'Le caractère universel du **jugement** et la charité sans frontière en Mt 25,31-46.' *La nouvelle revue théologique* 102 (1980), pp.179-196.

Friedrich, J. **Gott im Bruder?** *Eine methodenkritische Untersuchung von Redaktion, Überlieferung und Traditionen in Mt. 25, 31-46.* Stuttgart: Calwer, 1977.

Gewalt, D. '**Mt. 25, 31-46** im Erwartungshorizont heutiger Exegese.' *Linguistica Biblica* 25/26 (1973), pp.9-21.

Gray, S. *The Least of My* **Brothers**: *Matthew 25:31-46. A History of Interpetation.* Atlanta: SBL, 1989.

Gross, G. 'Die "geringsten Brüder" Jesu in **Mt. 25,40** in Auseinandersetzung mit der neueren Exegese.' *Bibel und Leben* 5 (1964), pp.172-180.

Hahn, F. 'Der **Sendungsauftrag** des auferstandenen Matthäus 28, 16-20'. In *Fides pro Mundi Vita* (ed. T. Sundermeier). Gütersloh: Mohn, 1980, pp.28-43.

Haufe, G. '**Soviel ihr getan habt** einem dieser meiner geringsten Brüder.' In *Ruf und Antwort. Festgabe für Em. Fuchs zum 90. Geburtstag.* Leipzig: 1964, pp.484ff.

Hülsbusch, W. 'Wenn der **Menschensohn** in seiner Herrlichkeit kommt.' *Bibel und Leben* 13 (1972), pp.207-214.

Ingelaere, J.-C. 'La Parabole du **Jugement** Dernier (Matthieu 25:31-46).' *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 50 (1970), pp.23-60.

Ladd, G.E. 'The Parable of the **Sheep and the Goats** in recent interpretation.' In *New Dimensions in New Testament Study* (edd. R. Longenecker & M. Tenney). Michigan: Zondervan, 1974, pp.191-199.

Maddox, R. 'Who Are the **"Sheep" and the "Goats"**? A Study of the Purpose and Meaning of Matthew XXV:31-46.' *Australian Biblical Review* 13 (1965), pp.19-28.

Mánek, J. 'Mit wem identifiziert sich Jesus? Eine exegetische Rekonstruktion ad **Mt. 25:31-46**.' In *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament. In honour of Charles Francis Digby Moule* (edd. B. Lindars & S. Smalley). Cambridge: CUP, 1973, pp.15-25.

Michaels, J.R. 'Apostolic Hardships and Righteous Gentiles. A Study of **Matthew 25, 31-46**.' *JBL* 84 (1965), pp.27-37.

Mitton, C.L. 'Present Justification and **Final Judgment**; A Discussion of the Parable of the Sheep and the Goats.' *ExpTim* 68 (1956-57), pp.46-50.

Puzicha, M. **Christus Peregrinus**. *Die Fremdenaufnahme (Mt.25, 35) als Werk der privaten Wohltätigkeit im Urteil der Alten Kirche.* Münster: Aschendorff, 1980

Robinson, J.A.T. 'The "Parable" of the **Sheep and the Goats**.' *NTS* 2 (1956), pp.225-237.

Turner, H.E.W. 'Expounding the Parables; The Parable of the Sheep and the Goats (**Matthew 25:31-46**).' *ExpTim* 77 (1966), pp.243-246.

Via, D.O. 'Ethical Responsibility And Human Wholeness in **Matthew 25**:31-46.' *HTR* 80 (1987), pp.79-100.

Wilckens, U. 'Gottes geringste Brüder—zu **Mt. 25, 31-46**.' In *Jesus und Paulus. Festschrift für Werner Georg Kümmel zum 70. Geburtstag* (edd. E. Ellis & E. Grässer). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975, pp.363-383.

CHILDREN'S GAMES

Cotter, W. 'The Parable of the **Children** in the Market Place, Q(Lk) 7:31-5.' *NovT* 29 (1987), pp.289-304.

Feuillet, A. 'Jésus et la **sagesse** divine d'après les Évangiles synoptiques.' *RevB* 62 (1955), pp.161-196.

Linton, O. 'The Parable of the **Children's Game**.' *NTS* 22 (1976), pp.159-179.

Mussner, F. 'Der nicht erkannte **Kairos**; Mt. xi:16-19; Lk. vii:31-35.' *Bib* 40 (1959), pp.599-612.

Zeller, D. 'Die **Bildlogik** des Gleichnisses Mt.11.16f/Lk.7.31f.' *ZNW* 68 (1977), pp.252-257.

THE STRONG MAN

Gaston, L. ' "**Beelzebub**".' *TZ* 18 (1962), pp.247-255.

Grässer, E. '**Zum Verständnis** der Gottesherrschaft.' *ZNW* 65 (1974), pp.3-26.

Legasse, S. ' "**L'homme fort**" de Luc xi 21-22.' *NovT* 5 (1962), pp.5-9.

THE SHEEP

Arai, S. 'Das Gleichnis vom **verlorenen Schaf**: Ein traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung.' *Annual of the Japanese Biblical Institute* 2 (1976), pp.111-137,

Bishop, E. 'The Parable of the Lost or **Wandering Sheep**. Matthew 18:10-14; Luke 15;3-7.' *ATR* 44 (1962), pp.44-57.

Bussby, F. 'Did a **Shepherd** Leave Sheep upon the Mountains or in the Desert?' *ATR* 45 (1963), pp.93-94.

Buzy, D. 'La **brebis** perdue.' *RevB* 39 (1930), pp.47-61.

Derrett, J. 'Fresh Light on the Lost **Sheep** and the Lost Coin.' NTS 26 (1979), pp.36-60.

Dupont, J. 'Les implications christologiques de la parabole de la **brebis perdue**.' In *Jésus aux origines de la christologie* (ed. J. Dupont). Gembloux: Duculot, 1975, pp.331-350.

Farmer, W.R. '**Notes** on a Literary and Form-Critical Analysis of Some of the Synoptic Material peculiar to Luke.' *NTS* 8 (1961), pp.301-316.

Focant, C. 'La parabole de la **brebis perdue**.' In *La Foi et le Temps* 13 (1983), pp.52-79.

Gregg, R. 'Early Christian Variations on the Parable of the **Lost Sheep**.' *Duke Divinity School Review* 41 (1976), pp.85-104.

Kossen, H. 'Quelques remarques sur l'ordre des **paraboles** dans Luc xv et sur la structure de Matthieu xviii 8-14.' *NovT* 1 (1956), pp.75-80.

Monnier, J. 'Sur la grâce à propos de la parabole de la **brebis perdue**.' *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 16 (1936), pp.191-105.

Petersen, W. 'The Parable of the Lost **Sheep** in the Gospel of Thomas and the Synoptics.' *NovT* 23 (1981), pp.128-147.

Schnider, F. 'Das Gleichnis vom **verlorenen Schaf** und seine Redaktoren.' *Kairos* 19 (1977), pp.146-154.

Sweet, J. '**A Saying**, a Parable, a Miracle.' *Theology* 76 (1973), pp.125-133.

THE SOWER

Bultmann, R. 'Die Interpretation von **Mk.4, 3-9** seit Jülicher.' In *Jesus und Paulus: Festschrift für Werner Georg Kümmel zum 70. Geburtstag* (edd. E. Ellis & E. Grässer). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975, pp.30-34.

Cerfaux, L. '**Fructifiez** en supportant (l'épreuve) à propos de Luc., viii, 15.' In *Recueil Cerfaux*, III. Gembloux: Duculot, 1962, pp.111-122.

Dietzfelbinger, C. 'Das Gleichnis vom **ausgestreuten Samen**.' In *Der Ruf Jesu und die Antwort der Gemeinde. Exegetische Untersuchungen Joachim Jeremias zum 80. Geburtstag gewidmet von seinen Schülern* (edd. E. Lohse, C. Burchard, B. Schaller). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970, pp.80-93.

Dupont, J. 'La parabole du **semeur**.' In J. Dupont, *Études sur les Évangiles synoptiques*. 2 Vols. Leuven: Peeters, 1985.

Evans, C.A. 'On the Isaianic Background of the **Sower** Parable.' *CBQ* 47 (1985), pp.464-468.

Gerhardsson, B. 'The Parable of **the Sower** and its Interpretation.' *NTS* 14 (1968), pp.165-193.

Grayston, K. '**The Sower**.' *ExpTim* 55 (1943-44), pp.138-139.

Hahn, F. 'Das Gleichnis von der angestreuten Saat und seine Deutung (**Mk iv.3-8,14-20**).' In *Donum Gentilicium: Studies in honour of David Daube* (ed. E. Bammel). Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978, pp.133-142.

Horman, J. 'The Source of the Version of the Parable of the **Sower** in the Gospel of Thomas.' *NovT* 21 (1979), pp.326-343.

Lampe, P. 'Die markinische Deutung des Gleichnisses vom Sämann; **Markus 4.10-12**.' *ZNW* 65 (1974), pp.140-150.

Léon-Dufour, X. 'La parabole du **semeur**.' In *Études d'Évangile*. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1965, pp.255-301.

Lohfink, G. 'Das Gleichnis vom **Sämann** (Mk 4,3-9).' *BZ* N.F. 30 (1986), pp.36-69.

Luck, U. 'Das Gleichnis von **Sämann** und die Verkündigung Jesu.' *Wort und Dienst* 11 (1971), pp.73-92.

Marin, L. 'Essai d'analyse structurale d'une récit-parabole: **Matthieu 13:1-23**.' *Études théologiques et religieuses* 46 (1971), pp.35-74.

Moule, C.F.D. '**Mark 4:1-20** Yet Once More.' In *Neotestamentica et Semitica; Studies in honour of Matthew Black* (edd. E. Ellis & M. Wilcox). Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1969, pp.95-113.

Payne, P. 'The Order of Sowing and Ploughing in the Parable of the **Sower**.' *NTS* 25 (1978), pp.123-129.

Thiering, B. '**Breaking of Bread** and Harvest in Mark's Gospel.' *NovT* 12 (1970), pp.1-12.

Wenham, D. 'The **Interpretation** of the Parable of the Sower.' *NTS* 20 (1974), pp.299-319.

White, K. 'The Parable of the **Sower**.' *JTS* 15 (1964), pp.300-307.

Wilder, A. 'The Parable of the **Sower: Naïveté** and Method in Interpretation.' *Semeia* 2 (1974), pp.134-151.

THE TARES

Brock, S. 'An Additional **Fragment** of 0106?' *JTS* 20 (1969), pp.225-228.

Catchpole, D. 'John the Baptist, Jesus and the Parable of the **Tares**.' *SJT* 31 (1978), pp.557-570.

De Goedt, M. 'L'explication de la parabole de l'ivraie; **Matt. XIII, 36-43**; création mattéenne, ou aboutissement d'une histoire littéraire?' *RevB* 66 (1959), pp.32-54.

Doty, W.G. '**An Interpretation**: Parable of the Weeds and Wheat.' *Interpretation* 25 (1971), pp.185-193.

Güttgemanns, E. '**Bemerkungen** zur linguistischen Analyse von Matthäus 13, 24-30, 36-43.' *Linguistica Biblica* 37 (1976), pp.81-97.

Jeremias, J. 'Die Deutung des Gleichnisses vom Unkraut unter dem Weizen (**Mt 13.36-43**).' In *Neotestamentica et Patristica. Eine Freundesgabe, Herrn Professor Oscar Cullmann zu seinem 60. Geburtstag überreicht* (edd. B. Reicke & W. van Unnik). Leiden: Brill, 1962, pp.59-63.

Marguerat, D. 'L'Église et le **monde** en Matthieu 13, 36-43.' *Revue de théologie et de philosophie* 110 (1978), pp.111-129.

THE MUSTARD SEED & THE LEAVEN

Bartsch, H.W. 'Eine bisher übersehene **Zitierung** der LXX in Mark 4, 30.' *TZ* 15 (1959), pp.126-128.

Burchard, C. 'Senfkorn, Sauerteig, Schatz und Perle in **Matthäus 13**.' *Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt* 13 (1988), pp.5-35.

Dupont, J. 'Le couple parabolique du **Sénevé** et du Levain.' In *Jesus Christus in Historie und Theologie. Neutestamentliche Festschrift für Hans Conzelmann zum 60. Geburtstag* (ed. G. Strecker). Tübingen: Mohr, 1975, pp.331-345.

Funk, R. 'Beyond Criticism in Quest of Literacy: The Parable of the **Leaven**.' *Interpretation* 25 (1971), pp.149-170.

—— 'The **Looking-Glass Tree** is for the Birds; Ezekiel 17: 22-24; Mark 4: 30-32.' *Interpretation* 27 (1973), pp.3-9.

Kuss, O. 'Zur **Senfkornparabel**.' In O. Kuss, *Auslegung und Verkündigung* I. Regensburg: Pustet, 1963, pp.78-84.

—— 'Zum **Sinngehalt** des Doppelgleichnisses vom Senfkorn und Sauerteig.' In O. Kuss, *Auslegung und Verkündigung* I. Regensburg: Pustet, 1963, pp.85-97.

Laufen, R. '**ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ** und ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑ. Eine traditions- und redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung des Gleichnisses vom Senfkorn.' In *Begegnung mit dem Wort: Festschrift für Heinrich Zimmermann* (edd. J. Zmijewski & E. Nellessen). Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1979, pp.105-140.

McArthur, H. 'Parable of the **Mustard Seed**.' *CBQ* 33 (1971), pp.198-210.

Matthews, A.J. 'The Mustard "Tree".' *ExpTim* 39 (1927-28), pp.32-34.

Mussner, F. '1QHodajoth und das Gleichnis vom **Senfkorn** (Mk. 4, 30-32 Par.).' *BZ* N.F. 4 (1960), pp.128-130.

Schultze, B. 'Die ekklesiologische Bedeutung des Gleichnisses vom **Senfkorn** (Matth. 13, 31-32; Mk. 4, 30-32; Lk. 13, 18-19).' *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 27 (1961), pp.382-386.

HID TREASURE

Bishop, E. 'θησαυρῷ κακρυμμένῳ ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ (Mt. XIII. 44) σκάψω περὶ αὐτήν (Lk. XIII. 8).' *ExpTim* 65 (1953-54), p.287.

Charles, R.H. 'Two Parables: A Study.' *ExpTim* 35 (1923-24), pp.265-269.

Crossan, J.D. 'Hidden **Treasure** Parables in Late Antiquity.' SBL 1976 Seminar Papers. Missoula: Scholars' Press, pp.359-379.

—— **Finding** *is the First Act. Trove Folktales and Jesus' Treasure Parables.* Montana: Scholars' Press, 1979.

Dauvillier, J. 'La parabole du **trésor** et les droits orientaux.' *Revue internationale des droits de l'antiquité* 3rd Series, 4 (1957), pp.107-115.

Derrett, J.D.M. 'The **Treasure** in the Field.' In J.D.M. Derrett, *Law in the New Testament.* London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1970, pp.1-16.

Dupont, J. 'Les **paraboles** du trésor et de la perle.' *NTS* 14 (1968), pp.408-418.

Faccio, P.H. 'De **Thesauro** abscondito (Mt. 14:33).' *Verbum Domini* 28 (1950), pp.237-242.

Fenton, J. 'Expounding the **Parables**: IV. The Parables of the Treasure and the Pearl (Mt. 13:44-46).' *ExpTim* 77 (1965-66), pp.178-180.

Kulp, H. 'Der **Schatz** im Acker.' *EvT* 13 (1953-54), pp.145-149.

Magass, W. ' "Der **Schatz** im Acker" (Mt. 13, 44): Von der Kirche als einem Tauschphänomen—Paradigmatik und Transformation.' *Linguistica Biblica* 21 (1973), pp.2-18.

Sider, J.W. 'Interpreting the Hid **Treasure**.' *Christian Scholar's Review* 13 (1984), pp.360-372.

Tonkin, S. 'The Parable of the Hidden Treasure and of the Pearl Merchant (**Matt 13:44ff.**).' *ExpTim* 33 (1921-22), pp.330-331.

THE PEARL

Charles, R.H. 'Two Parables: A **Study**.' *ExpTim* 35 (1923-24), pp.265-269.

Dehandschutter, B. 'La parabole de la **perle** (Matt. 13.45-46) et l'Évangile selon Thomas.' *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* 55 (1979), pp.243-265.

Dupont, J. 'Les **paraboles** du trésor et de la perle.' *NTS* 14 (1968), pp.408-418.

Fenton, J. 'Expounding the **Parables**: IV. The Parables of the Treasure and the Pearl (Mt.13:44-46).' *ExpTim* 77 (1965-66), pp.178-180.

Findlay, G.G. 'The Parable of the **Pearl**-Merchant.' *Expositor* 7th ser., 5 (1908), pp.158-170.

Gibbs, J. '**Parables** of Atonement and Assurance: Matthew 13:44-46.' *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 51 (1987), pp.19-43.

Glombitza, O. 'Der **Perlenkaufmann**. Eine exegetische Studie zur Matth. XIII, 45-46.' *NTS* 7 (1960-61), pp.153-161.

Hayman, H.S. 'The Parable of the **Pearl** Merchant: Matthew XIII. 45, 46.' *ExpTim* 49 (1937-38), p.142.

Jacobson, D. 'An **Exposition** of Matthew 13:44-52.' *Interpretation* 29 (1975), pp.277-282.

Schippers, R. 'The Mashal Character of the Parable of the **Pearl**.' *Studia Evangelica* II (ed. F. Cross). Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1964, pp.236-241.

Tonkin, S. 'The Parable of the Hidden Treasure, and of the Pearl Merchant (**Matt 13:44ff.**).' *ExpTim* 33 (1921-22), pp.330-331.

THE NET

Morrice, W. 'The Parable of the **Dragnet** and the Gospel of Thomas.' *ExpTim* 95 (1983-84), pp.269-273.

Quispel, G. 'Jewish-Christian Gospel **Tradition**.' *A T R* Supplementary Studies 3 (1974), pp.112-116.

Wuellner, W. *The Meaning of* '**Fishers of Men**'. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967.

SALT, LIGHT & CITY

Cullmann, O. '**Que signifie** le sel dans la parabole de Jésus?' *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 37 (1957), pp.36-43.

——— 'Das Gleichnis vom **Salz**.' In O. Cullmann, *Vorträge und Aufsätze 1925-62* (ed. K. Fröhlich). Tübingen: Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1966, pp.192-201.

Hutton, W. 'The **Salt** Sections.' *ExpTim* 58 (1946-47), pp.166-168.

Jeremias, J. 'Die **Lampe** unter dem Sheffel.' In J. Jeremias, *Abba. Studien zur neustestamentlichen Theologie und Zeitgeschichte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966, pp.99-102.

Kennedy, H. 'The Composition of **Mark IV, 21-25**: A Study in the Synoptic Problem.' *ExpTim* 25 (1913-14), pp.301-305.

Nauck, W. 'Salt as a Metaphor in Instructions for Discipleship.' *ST* 6 (1953), pp.165-178.

Schneider, G. 'Das Bildwort von der Lampe: Zur Traditionsgeschichte eines Jesus-Wortes.' *ZNW* 16 (1970), pp.183-209.

Schwarz, G. 'Matthäus V.13a und 14a **Emendation** und Rückübersetzung.' *NTS* 17 (1970), pp.80-86.

Souček, J. '**Salz** der Erde und Licht der Welt. Zur Exegese von Matth. 5, 13-16.' *TZ* 19 (1963), pp.169-179.

von Rad, G. 'The **City** on the Hill.' In G. von Rad, *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*. New York, 1966, pp.232-242.

NEW WINE

Beckwith, R. 'The Feast of **New Wine** and the Question of Fasting.' *ExpTim* 95 (1983-84), pp.334-335.

Brooke, G. 'The Feast of **New Wine** and the Question of Fasting.' *ExpTim* 95 (1983-84), pp.175-176.

Dupont, J. '**Vin** vieux, vin nouveau (Luc 5, 39).' *CBQ* 25 (1963), pp.286-304.

Hahn, F. 'Die Bildworte vom neuen Flicken und vom jungen **Wein** (Mk 2,21f.parr).' *EvT* 31 (1971), pp.357-375.

Hooker, M. **Continuity** *and Discontinuity. Early Christianity in its Jewish Setting*. London: Epworth, 1986.

Kee, A. 'The Old Coat and the New **Wine**; a Parable of Repentance.' *NovT* 12 (1970), pp.13-21.

Lewis, F. 'New **Garments** and Old Patches.' *ExpTim* 13 (1901-02), p.522.

Muddiman, J. 'Jesus and **Fasting**. Mark ii.18-22.' *Jésus aux origines de la christologie* (ed. J. Dupont). Gembloux: Duculot, 1975, pp.271-281.

Nagel, W. 'Neuer **Wein** in alten Schläuchen (Mt. 9,17).' *Vigiliae Christianae* 14 (1960), pp.1-8.

THE TENANTS

Bammel, E. 'Das **Gleichnis** von den bösen Winzern (Mk.12,1-9) und das jüdische Erbrecht.' *Revue internationale des droits de l'antiquité* 3rd series, 6 (1959), pp.11-17.

Blank, J. 'Die **Sendung** des Sohnes. Zur christologischen Bedeutung des Gleichnisses von den bösen Winzern.' In *Neues Testament und Kirche. Für Rudolf Schnackenburg* (ed. J. Gnilka). Freiburg: Herder, 1974, pp.11-41.

Crossan, J.D. 'The Parable of the **Wicked Husbandmen**.' *JBL* 90 (1971), pp.451-465.

Dehandschutter, B. 'La parabole des **vignerons** homicides (Mc. 12,1-12) et L'Évangile selon Thomas (logion 65).' In *L'Évangile selon Marc: tradition et rédaction* (ed. M. Sabbe). Gembloux: Duculot, 1974, pp.203-219.

Derrett, J.D.M. 'The Parable of the **Wicked Vinedressers**.' In J.D.M. Derrett, *Law in the New Testament*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1970, pp.286-312.

—— '**Allegory** and the Wicked Vinedressers.' *JTS* 35 (1974), pp.426-432.

Dietzfelbinger, C. 'Das Gleichnis von den Arbeitern im **Weinberg** als Jesuswort.' *EvT* 43 (1983), pp.126-137.

Drury, J. 'The **Sower**, the Vineyard, and the Place of Allegory in the Interpretation of Mark's Parables.' *JTS* 24 (1973), pp.367-379.

Frankemölle, H. 'Hat Jesus sich selbst verkündet? Christologische **Implikationen** in den vormarkinischen Parabeln.' *Bibel und Leben* 13 (1972), pp.184-207.

Gray, A. 'The Parable of the **Wicked** Husbandmen.' *The Hibbert Journal* 19 (1920-21), pp.42-52.

Hengel, M. 'Das Gleichnis von den Weingärtnern Mc. 12, 1-12 im Lichte der **Zenonpapyri** und der rabbinischen Gleichnisse.' *ZNW* 59 (1968), pp.1-39.

Hubaut, M. *La parabole des* **vignerons** *homicides*. Paris: Gebald, 1976.

Klauck, H.-J. 'Das Gleichnis vom Mord im **Weinberg**.' *Bibel und Leben* 11 (1970), pp.118-145.

Kümmel, W.G. 'Das Gleichnis von den bösen Weingärtnern (Mark 12, 1-9).' In *Aux sources de la tradition chrétienne. Mélanges offerts à Maurice Goguel à l'occasion de son soixante-dixième anniversaire*. Neuchâtel-Paris, 1950, pp.120-131.

Lowe, M. 'From the Parable of the **Vineyard** to a Pre-Synoptic Source.' *NTS* 28 (1982), pp.257-263.

Milavec, A. 'A Fresh Analysis of the Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen in the Light of Jewish-Christian Dialogue.' In *Parables and Story in Judaism and Christianity* (ed. C. Thoma). New York: Paulist Press, 1989, pp.81-120.

—— 'The Identity of "the Son" and the "Others": Mark's Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen Reconsidered.' *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 20 (1990), pp.30-37.

Morrice, W.G. 'The parable of the **tenants** and the gospel of Thomas.' *ExpTim* 98 (1986-87), pp.104-107.

Mussner, F. 'Die **bösen Winzer** nach Matthäus 21, 33-46.' In *Antijudaismus im Neuen Testament? Exegetische und systematische Beiträge* (edd. W. Eckert et al.). Munich: Kaiser, 1967, pp.129-134.

Newell, J. & R. 'The Parable of the Wicked **Tenants.**' *NovT* 14 (1972), pp.226-237.

O'Neill, J.C. 'The Source of the Parables of the Bridegroom and the Wicked **Husbandmen.**' *JTS* 39 (1988), pp.485-489.

Robinson, J.A.T. 'The Parable of the **Wicked Husbandmen**. A Test of Synoptic Relationships.' *NTS* 21 (1974-75), pp.443-461.

Snodgrass, K.R. 'The Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen. Is the Gospel of Thomas Version the **Original**?' *NTS* 21 (1974), pp.142-144.

—— *The Parable of the Wicked* **Tenants**. Tübingen: Mohr, 1983.

Spicq, C. 'ἐντραπήσονται τὸν υἱόν μου.' *RevB* 68 (1961), pp.73-78.

Stern, D. 'Jesus' Parables from the **Perspective** of Rabbinic Literature: The Example of the Wicked Husbandmen.' In *Parables and Story in Judaism and Christianity* (ed. C. Thoma). New York: Paulist Press, 1989, pp.42-80.

Swaeles, R. 'L'**arrière-fond** scripturaire de Matt. XXI.43 et son lien avec Matt. XXI.44.' *NTS* 6 (1959-60), pp.310-313.

THE FEAST

Bacon, B.W. 'Two Parables of **Lost Opportunity**.' *The Hibbert Journal* 21 (1922-23), pp.337-352.

Ballard, P.H. 'Reasons for Refusing the **Great Supper**.' *JTS* 23 (1972), pp.341-350.

Batey, R.A. *New Testament* **Nuptial Imagery**. Leiden: Brill, 1971.

Beare, F.W. 'The Parables of the Guests at the **Banquet**: A Sketch of the History of its Interpretation.' In *The Joy of Study. Papers in Honor of F.C. Grant.* New York: Macmillan, 1951, pp.1-14.

Derrett, J.D. 'The Parable of the **Great Supper**.' In J.D.M. Derrett, *Law in the New Testament.* London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1970, pp.126-155.

Funk, R. 'The Parable of the **Great Supper**.' In R. Funk, *Language, Hermeneutic and Word of God.* New York: Harper & Row, 1966, pp.163ff.

Glombitza, O. 'Das grosse **Abendmahl**. Lukas XIV: 12-24.' *NovT* 5 (1962), pp.10-16.

Haenchen, E. 'Das Gleichnis vom **grossen Mahl**.' In E. Haenchen, *Die Bibel und wir. Gesammelte Aufsätze.* Vol. 2. Tübingen: Mohr, 1968, pp.135-155.

Hahn, F. 'Das Gleichnis von der **Einladung** zum Festmahl.' In *Verborum Veritas. Festschrift für Gustav Stählin zum 70. Geburtstag* (edd. O. Böcher & K. Haacker). Wuppertal: Brockhaus, 1970, pp.51-82.

Hasler, V. 'Die königliche Hochzeit, **Matt. 22:1-14**.' *TZ* 18 (1962), pp.25-35.

Jeremias, J. '**Beobachtungen** zu neutestamentlichen Stellen an Hand des neugefundenen griechischen Henoch-Textes. Lc. 14, 18: ἀπὸ μιᾶς.' *ZNW* 38 (1939), p.118.

Linnemann, E. 'Überlegungen zur Parabel vom grossen Abendmahl Lc.14, 15-24 und **Mt.22,1-14**.' *ZNW* 51 (1960), pp.246-255.

Magass, W. 'Semiotik einer **Tischordnung** (Lk.14, 7-14).' *Linguistica Biblica* 25/26 (1973), pp.2-8.

Merriman, E.H. '**Matthew xxii.1-14**.' *ExpTim* 66 (1954-55), p.61.

Michaelis, W. *Das Hochzeitliche* **Kleid**. *Eine Einführung in die Gleichnisse Jesu über die rechte Jüngerschaft.* Berlin: Furche-Verlag, 1939.

Palmer, H. 'Just **Married**, Cannot Come (Matthew 22, Luke 14, Thomas 44, Dt. 20).' *NovT* 18 (1976), pp.241-257.

Rengstorf, K.H. 'Die **Stadt** der Mörder (Mt.22:7).' In *Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche. Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias* (ed. W. Eltester). Berlin: Töpelmann, 1960, pp.106-129.

Sanders, J.A. 'The Ethic of **Election** in Luke's Great Banquet Parable.' In *Essays in Old Testament Ethics. J. Philip Hyatt in Memoriam* (edd. J.L. Crenshaw & J.T. Willis). New York: KTAV, 1974, pp.245-271.

Schlier, H. 'Der **Ruf** Gottes. Eine biblische Besinnung zum Gleichnis vom königlichen Hochzeitmahl (Mt. 22, 1-14).' In H. Schlier, *Besinnung auf das Neue Testament: Exegetische Aufsätze und Vorträge* II. Freiburg: Herder, 1964, pp.219-226.

Sim, D. 'The Man without the **Wedding Garment** (Matthew 22.1-13).' *Heythrop Journal* 31 (1990), pp.165-178.

—— 'Matthew 22.13a and 1 Enoch 10.4a: A Case of **Literary Dependence**?' *JSNT* 47 (1992), pp.3-19.

Swaeles, R. 'L'orientation ecclésiastique de la parabole du **festin nuptial** en Mt. XXII, 1-14.' *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* 36 (1960), pp.655-684.

Trilling, W. 'Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte des Gleichnisses vom **Hochzeitsmahl**, Mt. 22, 1-14.' *BZ* N.F. 4 (1960), pp.251-265.

Vaccari, A. 'La parabole du **festin des noces** (Mt. XXII, 1-14). Notes d'exégèse.' *Recherches de science religieuse* 39 (1951), pp.138-145.

Via, D. O. 'The Relationship of Form to Content in the Parables: **The Wedding Feast**.' *Interpretation* 25 (1971), pp.171-185.

Vögtle, A. 'Die Einladung zum grossen Gastmahl und zum königlichen **Hochzeitsmahl**.' *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien.* Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1971, pp.171-218.

TWO SONS

Derrett, J.D. 'The Parable of the **Two Sons**.' *ST* 25 (1971), pp.109-116.

Guy, H.A. 'The Parable of the **Two Sons** (Matt. xxi. 28-31.).' *ET* 51 (1939-40), pp.204-205.

Macgregor, W.M. 'The Parable of the **Two Sons**.' *ET* 38 (1926-27), pp.498-501.

Merkel, H. 'Das Gleichnis von den "**Ungleichen Söhnen**" (Matth. XXI, 28-32).' *NTS* 20 (1974), pp.254-261.

Michaels, J.R. 'The Parable of the **Regretful Son**.' *HTR* 61 (1968), pp.15-26.

Richards, W.L. 'Another Look at the Parable of the **Two Sons**.' *Biblical Research* 23 (1978), pp.5-14.

Riggenbach, E. 'Zur **Exegese** und Textkritik zweier Gleichnisse Jesu.' In *Aus Schrift und Geschichte. Festschrift für Adolf Schlatter.* Stuttgart: Calwer, 1922, pp.17-34.

Schmid, J. 'Das textgeschichtliche Problem der Parabel von den **zwei Söhnen**.' In *Vom Wort des Lebens. Festschrift für Max Meinertz zur Vollendung des 70. Lebensjahres 19 Dezember 1950* (ed. N. Adler). Münster: Aschendorff, 1951, pp.68-84.

THE WORKERS

Bauer, J.B. '**Gnadenlohn** oder Tageslohn (Mt 20,8-16)?' *Bib* 42 (1961), pp.224-228.

Blinzler, J. 'Gottes schenkende **Güte**: Matth. 20,1-16.' *Bibel und Liturgie* 64 (1963), pp.12-17.

Broer, I. 'Die **Gleichnisexegese** und die neuere Literaturwissenschaft. Ein Diskussionsbeitrag zur Exegese von Mt 20,1-16.' *Biblische Notizen* 5 (1978), pp.13-27.

Curtis, W.A. 'The Parable of the **Labourers**, Matt. xx. 1-16.' *ET* 38 (1926-27), pp.6-10.

Derrett, J.D. 'Workers in the **Vineyard**: A Parable of Jesus.' In J.D.M. Derrett, *Studies in the New Testament* I (1977), pp.48-75.

De Ru, G. 'Conception of **Reward** in the Teaching of Jesus.' *NovT* 8 (1966), pp.202-222.

Duplacy, J. 'Le maître généreux et les **ouvriers** égoistes.' *Bible et vie chrétienne* 44 (1962), pp.16-30.

Fonck, L. '**Operarii** in vinea (Mt. 20, 1-16).' *Verbum Domini* 4 (1924), pp.33-40.

Gryglewicz, F. 'The Gospel of the Overworked **Workers**.' *CBQ* 19 (1957), pp.190-198.

Haubeck, W. 'Zum Verständnis der Parabel von den Arbeitern im **Weinberg** (Mt 20,1-15).' In *Wort in der Zeit. Neutestamenthiche Studien. Festgabe für Karl Heinrich Rengstorf zum 75. Geburtstag* (edd. W. Haubeck & M. Bachmann). Leiden: Brill, 1980, pp.95-107.

Hertel, F. 'Umkehr durch die **Güte** Gottes.' *Festgabe für Friedrich Lang* (edd. O. Bayer & G.-U. Wanzeck). Tübingen: Achblatt, 1978, pp.329-336.

Hezser, C. *Lohnmetaphorik und Arbeitswelt in Mt 20,1-16. Das Gleichnis von den Arbeitern im* **Weinberg** *im Rahmen rabbinischer Lohngleichnisse*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990.

Hoppe, R. 'Gleichnis und **Situation**.' *BZ* N.F. 28 (1984), pp.1-22.

Keith, K. 'The Labourers in the **Vineyard** (Mt 20,1-16). Scholarly Opinions from 1950 through to 1988.' STL Thesis. Leuven, 1989.

Mitton, C.L. 'Expounding the Parables: The **Workers** in the Vineyard (**Matt. 20:1-16**).' *ExpTim* 77 (1965-66), pp.307-311.

Rengstorf, K.. 'Die Frage des gerechten Lohnes in der Verkündigung Jesu.' In the Karl Arnold *Festschrift* 1955 (MS in the University Library, Heidelberg).

Schenke, L. 'Die Interpretation der Parabel von den "Arbeitern im **Weinberg**" (Mt 20,1-15) durch Matthäus.' In *Studien zum Matthäusevangelium. Festschrift für Wilhelm Pesch* (ed. L. Schenke): Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1988, pp.245-268.

Schnider, F. 'Von der Gerechtigkeit Gottes; Beobachtungen zum Gleichnis von den Arbeitern im **Weinberg**, Mt 20,1-16.' *Kairos* 23 (1981), pp.88-95.

Schottroff, L. 'Die Güte Gottes und die **Solidarität** von Menschen. Das Gleichnis von den Arbeitern im Weinberg.' In *Der Gott der kleinen Leute. Sozialgeschichtliche Bibelauslegungen* II (edd. W. Schottroff & W. Stegemann). Munich: Kaiser, 1979^2, pp.71-93.

Spies, Otto. 'Die **Arbeiter** im Weinberg (Mt. 20:1-15), in islamischer Überlieferung.' *ZNW* 66 (1975), pp.279-283.

Wolf, E. 'Gottesrecht und Nächstenrecht. Recht theologische Exegese des Gleichnisses von den Arbeitern im Weinberg (Mt 20,1-16).' In *Gott in der Welt. Festschrift für Karl Rahner* (ed. H. Vorgrimler). Freiburg: Herder, 1964, pp.640-662.

FIG TREE

Derrett, J. 'Figtrees in the New Testament.' *Heythrop Journal* 14 (1973), pp.249-265.

Dupont, J. 'La parabole du figuier qui bourgeonne.' *RevB* 75 (1968), pp.541ff.

Kahn, J.G. 'La parabole du figuier stérile et les arbres récalcitrants de las Genèse.' *NovT* 13 (1971), pp.38-45.

Löw, I. 'Zum Feigengleichnis.' *ZNW* 11 (1910), pp.167-168.

Telford, W. *The* Barren Temple *and the Withered Tree*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980.

THE THIEF & THE TWO SERVANTS

Beare, F.W. 'The Synoptic Apocalypse Matthean Version.' In *Understanding the Sacred Text. Essays in honor of Morton S. Enslin on the Hebrew Bible and Christian Beginnings* (ed. J. Reumann). Valley Forge: Judson, 1972, pp.112-133.

Betz, O. 'The Dichotomized Servant and the End of Judas Iscariot. (Light on the Dark Passages: Matthew 24, 51 and Parallel; Acts 1, 18.)' *RevQ* 5 (1964), pp.43-58.

Burnett, F.W. 'Prolegomena to Reading Matthew's Eschatological Discourse: Redundancy and the Education of the Reader in Matthew.' *Semeia* 31 (1985), pp.91-119.

Edwards, R. 'The Eschatological Correlative as a Gattung in the New Testament.' *ZNW* 60 (1969), pp.9-20.

Gollinger, H. ' "Ihr wisst nicht, an welchem Tag euer Herr kommt". Auslegung von Mt. 24,37-51.' *Bibel und Leben* 11 (1970), pp.238-246.

Smitmans, A. 'Das Gleichnis vom Dieb.' In *Das Wort Gottes in der Zeit. Festschrift für Karl Hermann Schelkle zum 65. Geburtstag* (edd. H. Feld & J. Nolte). Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1973, pp.43-68.

THE TEN YOUNG WOMEN

Argyle, A. W. 'Wedding Customs at the Time of Jesus.' *ET* 86 (1974-75), pp.214-215.

Burkitt, F.C. 'The Parable of the Ten Virgins.' *JTS* 30 (1929), pp.267-270.

Derrett, J.D.M. 'La parabola delle vergini stolte.' In J.D.M. Derrett, *Studies in the New Testament* I. Leiden: Brill, 1977, pp.128-142.

Didier, M. 'La parabole des vièrges (Mt.25, 1-13).' *La foi et le temps* 3 (1970), pp.329-350.

Donfried, K.P. 'The Allegory of the Ten Virgins (Matt. 25: 1-13) as a Summary of Matthean Theology.' *JBL* 93 (1974), pp.415-428.

Ford, J.M. 'The Parable of the **Foolish Scholars**; Matt. 25:1-13.' *NovT* 9 (1967), pp.107-123.

Jeremias, J. 'Λαμπάδες Mt. 25,1,3f.,7f.' *ZNW* 56 (1965), pp.196-201.

Légasse, S. 'La parabole des dix **vièrges** (Mt. 25,1-13). Essai de synthèse historico-critique.' In *Les paraboles évangéliques* (ed. J. Delorme). Paris: Cerf, 1989, pp.349-360.

Maisch, J. 'Das Gleichnis von den klugen und den törichten **Jungfrauen**. Auslegung von Mt. 25, 1-13.' *Bibel und Leben* 11 (1970), pp.247-259.

Meinertz, M. 'Die Tragweite des Gleichnisses von den zehn **Jungfrauen**.' In *Synoptische Studien. Festschrift für Alfred Wikenhauser*. Munich: Zink, 1953, pp.94-106.

Paret, R. 'Sure 57, 11ff., und das Gleichnis von den klugen und den törichten **Jungfrauen**.' In *Festschrift für Wilhelm Eilers* (ed. G. Wiessner). Wiesbaden, 1967, pp.387-400.

Puig i Tàrrech, A. *La parabole des* **dix vièrges** (Mt.25,1-13). Rome: Biblical Institute, 1983.

Schenk, W. '**Auferweckung** der Toten oder Gericht nach den Werken. Tradition und Redaktion in Matthäus 25, 1-13.' *NovT* 20 (1978), pp.278-299.

Schwarz, G. 'Zum **Vokabular** von Matthäus XXV 1-12.' *NTS* 27 (1980), pp.270-276.

Seitz, O. 'Antecedents and Signification of the term ΔΙΨΥΧΟΣ.' *JBL* 66 (1947), pp.211-219.

Staats, R. 'Die törichten **Jungfrauen** von Mt. 25 in gnostischer und antignostischer Literatur.' In *Beihefte zur ZNW* 37 (1969), pp.94-105, and *Christentum und Gnosis* (ed. W. Eltester), Berlin, 1969, pp.98-115.

Strobel, F.A. 'Zum Verständnis von **Mat. XXV,1-13**.' *NovT* 2 (1958), pp.199-227.

THE TALENTS

Brightman, F.E. 'S. Luke xix, 21: No.1 of Six **Notes**.' *JTS* 29 (1927-28), p.158.

Candlish, R. 'The **Pounds** and the Talents.' *ExpTim* 23 (1911-12), pp.136-137.

Dauvillier, J. 'La parabole des **mines** ou des talents et le # 99 du code de Hammourabi.' In *Mélanges dédiés à Joseph Magnol*. Paris: Recueil Sirey, 1948, pp.153-165.

Derrett, J.D. 'Law in the New Testament; the Parables of the **Talents** and Two Logia.' *ZNW* 56 (1966), pp.184-195.

Didier, M. 'La parabole des **talents** et des mines.' In *De Jésus aux Évangiles*. Gembloux: Duculot, 1967, pp.248-271.

Dupont, J. 'La parabole des **talents** (Mat.25:14-30) ou des mines (Luc 19:12-27).' *Revue de théologie et de philosophie* 19 (1969), pp.376-391.

Flusser, D. 'Aesop's Miser and the Parable of the **Talents**.' In *Parable and Story in Judaism and Christianity* (ed. C. Thoma). New York, Paulist Press, 1989, pp.9-25.

Förster, W. 'Das Gleichnis von der anvertrauten **Pfunden**.' In *Verbum Dei manet in aeternum. Eine Festschrift für Prof. D. Otto Schmitz* (ed. W. Förster). Witten: Luther, 1953, pp.37-56.

Holdcraft, I.T. 'The Parable of the **Pounds** and Origen's Doctrine of Grace.' *JTS* 24 (1973), pp.503-504.

Joüon, P. 'La parabole des **mines** (Luc 19, 13-27) et la parabole des talents (Matthieu 25, 14-30).' *Recherches de science religieuse* 29 (1939), pp.489-494.

Kamlah, E. 'Kritik und Interpretation der Parabel von den anvertrauten **Geldern** Mt. 25: 14ff.; Lk.19: 12ff.' *Kerygma und Dogma* 14 (1968), pp.28-38.

Kuhn, K.G. '**Giljonim** und sifre minim.' In *Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche. Festschrift für Jaachim Jeremias* (ed. W. Eltester). Berlin: Töpelmann, 1960, pp.24-61.

Lüthi, W. 'Das Gleichnis von anvertrauten **Pfund**. Predigt uber Lk 19, 11-27.' In *Das Wort sie sollen lassen stehn. Festschrift für Albert Schädelin*. Bern: Lang, 1950, pp.207-214.

Lys, D. 'Contre le salut par les œuvres dans la prédication des **talents**.' *Études théologiques et religieuses* 64 (1989), pp.331-340.

McCulloch, W. 'The Pounds and the **Talents**.' *ExpTim* 23 (1911-12), pp.382-383.

McGaughy, L. 'The **Fear** of Yahweh and the Mission of Judaism: A Postexilic Maxim and its Early Christian Expansion in the Parable of the Talents.' *JBL* 94 (1975), pp.235-245.

Puig i Tàrrech, A. 'La parabole des talents (Mt 25,14-20) ou des mines (Lc 19,11-28).' In J. Dupont, *À cause de l'Évangile*. Paris: Cerf, 1985, pp.165-193.

Resenhöfft, W. 'Jesu Gleichnis von den Talenten, ergänzt durch die Lukas-Fassung.' *NTS* 26 (1980), pp.318-331.

Simpson, J.G. 'The Parable of the **Pounds**.' *ExpTim* 37 (1925-26), pp.299-303.

Stock, E. 'The Pounds and the **Talents**.' *ExpTim* 23 (1911-12), pp.136-137.

Weinert, F.D. 'The Parable of the **Throne Claimant** (Luke 19:12, 14-15a, 27) Reconsidered.' *CBQ* 39 (1977), pp.505-514.

Winterbotham, R. 'Christ, or **Archelaus**?' *Expositor* 8th series, 4 (1912), pp.338-347.

Zerwick, M. 'Die Parabel vom **Thronanwärter**.' *Bib* 40 (1959), pp.654-674.

6. GENERAL BACKGROUND: SOCIAL, RHETORICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL, PHILOSOPHICAL, THEOLOGICAL

Alon, A. **Fauna** *and Flora of the Bible.* British and Foreign Bible Society Handbook for Translators. 1970.

Alter, R. *The Art of Biblical* **Narrative**. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1981.

Barlow, S.A. *The* **Imagery** of Euripides. *A Study in the Dramatic Use of Pictorial Language.* Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 1986.

Beavis, M. 'Ancient **Slavery** as an Interpretative. A Context for the New Testament Servant Parables with Special Reference to the Unjust Steward (Lk 16:1-8).' *JBL* 111 (1992), pp.37-54.

Black, M. **Models** *and Metaphors.* New York: Cornell University Press, 1964.

Bowker, J. *The* **Targums** *and Rabbinic Literature. An Introduction to Jewish Interpretations of Scripture.* Cambridge: CUP, 1969.

Brenk, F.E. *In Mist Apparelled. Religious Themes in Plutarch's* **Moralia** *and Lives.* Leiden: Brill, 1977.

Brink, C.O. *On Reading a Horatian* **Satire***: An Interpretation of Sermones II.6.* Sydney: Sydney University Press, 1965.

Brown, R.E. & Meier J. **Antioch** *and Rome.* London: Chapman, 1982.

Carruthers, M. *The Book of Memory. A Study of* **Memory** *in Mediaeval Culture.* Cambridge: CUP, 1991.

Cathcart, K.J. 'The Trees, the Beasts and the Birds: **Fables**, Parables and Allegories in the Old Testament.' In *Wisdom in Ancient Israel* (edd. J. Day, R. Gordon & H. Williamson). Cambridge: CUP, 1995, pp.212-221.

Charlton, W. 'Living and Dead **Metaphors**'. *British Journal of Aesthetics* 15 (1975), pp.172-178.

Clingman, J. *The Novels of Nadine* **Gordimer**. London: Chatto & Windus, 1992.

Cohen, S.J. **Josephus** *in Galilee and Rome. His Vita and Development as a Historian.* Leiden: Brill, 1979.

Countryman, L.W. *The* **Rich** *Christian in the Church of the Early Empire.* New York: Edwin Mellen, 1980.

De Sousa, R. *The Rationality of* **Emotion**. Cambridge, Mass., and London: MIT, 1987, pp.107-139.

Di Marco, A. 'Der **Chiasmus** in der Bibel.' *Linguistica Biblica* 36 (1975), pp.21-97; 37 (1976), pp.49-68; 39 (1976), pp.37-85.

Downey, G. *A History of* **Antioch** *in Syria from Seleucus to the Arab Conquest.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961.

Esser, D. *Untersuchungen zu den Odenschlüssen bei* **Horaz**. Meisenheim: Anton Hain, 1976.

Finkelstein, L. **Akiba**, *Scholar, Saint and Martyr.* New York: Atheneum, 1970.

Finnegan, R. **Oral** *Literature in Africa.* Nairobi: OUP, 1971.

Fitzmyer, J. 'The **Languages** of Palestine in the First Century AD.' In *The Language of the New Testament: Classic Essays* (ed. S. Porter). Sheffield: JSOT, 1991, pp.126-162.

Fraenkel, E. *Aeschylus: Agamemnon.* Edition and **Commentary**. 3 Vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950.

Frei, H.W. *The* **Identity** *of Jesus Christ. The Hermeneutical Bases of Dogmatic Theology.* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.

Gadamer, H.-G. **Wahrheit** *und Methode. Grundzüge einer philosophischen Hermeneutik.* Tübingen: Mohr, 1965[2].

Gereboff, J. *Rabbi* **Tarfon**: *The Tradition, the Man and Early Rabbinic Judaism.* Montana: Scholars' Press, 1979.

Goody, J. (ed.) **Literacy** *in Traditional Societies.* Cambridge: CUP, 1975.

Gottwald, N. 'Social Class as an Analytic and Hermeneutical Category in Biblical Studies.' *JBL* 112 (1993), pp.3-22.

Graham, W. *Beyond the* **Written** *Word. Oral Aspects of Scripture in the History of Religion.* Cambridge: CUP, 1987.

Greimas, A. **Sémantique** *structurale.* Paris: Larousse, 1966.

Hall, S.G. **Melito** *of Sardis 'On Pascha' and Fragments.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979.

Halverson, J. '**Oral** and Written Gospel: A Critique of Werner Kelber.' *NTS* 40 (1994), pp.180-195.

Hanson, P. *The Dawn of Apocalyptic.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.

Harris, H.A. *Greek* **Athletics** *and the Jews.* Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1976.

Havelock, E.A. *The Muse Learns to Write. Reflections on* **Orality** *and Literacy from Antiquity to the Present.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986.

Henderson, I. 'Didache and **Orality** in Syoptic Comparison.' *JBL* 111, (1992), pp.283-306.

Honig, E. **Dark Conceit**. *The Making of Allegory.* Cambridge, Mass.: De Berry, 1960.

Horrell, D. 'The **Social Ethos** of Pauline Christianity. Interests and Ideology in the Corinthian Correspondence from 1 Corinthians to 1 Clement.' Ph.D. Thesis. Cambridge, 1993.

Hughes, F.W. *Early Christian* **Rhetoric** *and 2 Thessalonians.* Sheffield: JSOT, 1988.

Hurst, L.D. 'The Neglected Role of Semantics in the Search for the Aramaic Words of Jesus.' *JSNT* 28 (1986), pp.63-80.

Kanter, S. *Rabbi* **Gamaliel** *II: The Legal Traditions.* Missoula: Scholars' Press, 1980.

Kee, H.C. 'The **Ethical** Dimensions of the Testaments of the XII as a Clue to Provenance.' *NTS* 24 (1978), pp.259-270.

Körtner, U.H. **Papias** *vom Hierapolis. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des frühen Christentums.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983.

Kennedy, G.A. *Classical* **Rhetoric**. *Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times*. London: Croom Helm, 1980.

Lash, N. **Theology** *on the Way to Emmaus*. London: SCM, 1986.

Liebeschuetz, J.H. **Antioch**. Oxford: University Press, 1972.

Lord, A.B. *The Singer of* **Tales**. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1971[3].

McCabe, H. '**Analogy**.' In *Aquinas, Summa Theologiae*. Vol. 3: *Knowing and Naming God*. London: Eyre & Spottiswood, 1964.

McCall, M.H. *Ancient Rhetorical Theories of* **Simile** *and Comparison*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1969.

McLaughlin, J. '"Their Hearts were Hardened": The Use of Isaiah 6,9-10 in the Book of Isaiah.' *Bib* 75 (1994), pp.1-25.

McKinnon, A. & Webster, R. *A Method of Author Identification. The* **Computer** *in Literary and Linguistic Research* (ed. R. Wisbey). Cambridge: CUP, 1971.

Magass, W. 'Texte und Textilien. Ein Essay zur "Semiotik der Kleidung".' *Linguistica Biblica* 34 (1975), pp.23-36.

Meinhold, P. *Studien zu* **Ignatius** *von Antiochen*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1979.

Milbank, J. **Theology** *and Social Theory. Beyond Secular Reason*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1990.

Murdoch, I. **Metaphysics** *as a Guide to Morals*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1992.

Muszyński, H. **Fundament**, *Bild und Metapher in den Handschriften aus Qumran. Studie zur Vorgeschichte des ntl. Begriffs*. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1975.

Neusner, J. *Development of a Legend. Studies on the Traditions Concerning* **Yohanan** *Ben Zakkai*. Leiden: Brill, 1970.

—— *The Rabbinic Traditions about the* **Pharisees** *before 70*. Leiden: Brill, 1971.

—— **Eliezer** *ben Hyrcanus. The Tradition and the Man*. 2 Vols. Leiden: Brill, 1973.

—— *A History of the Mishnaic Law of* **Purities**. Part III: *Kelim. Literary and Historical Problems*. Leiden: Brill, 1974.

—— '**Types** and Forms in Ancient Jewish Literature. Some Comparisons.' In J. Neusner, *Early Rabbinic Judaism. Historical Studies in Religion, Literature and Art*. Leiden: Brill, 1975.

Ogden, G.S. 'The "Better"-**Proverb** (Tôb-Spruch), Rhetorical Criticism, and Qoheleth.' JBL 96 (1977), pp.489-505.

Olley, J. '*Righteousness' in the Septuagint of Isaiah: A Contextual Study*. Michigan: Ann Arbor, 1979.

Olsen, S.H. '**Authorial Intention**.' *British Journal of Aesthetics* 13 (1973), pp.219-231.

Osborn, E. *The* **Emergence** *of Christian Theology*. Cambridge, CUP, 1993.

Pekáry, T. *Die* **Wirtschaft** *der griechisch-römischen Antike.* Wiesbaden, 1976.

Petrounias, E. *Funktion und Thematik der Bilder bei* **Aischylos.** Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978.

Porter, S.E. (ed.) *The* **Language** *of the New Testament. Classic Essays.* Sheffield: JSOT, 1991.

Porton, G. *The Traditions of Rabbi* **Ishmael.** Leiden: Brill, 1977.

Préaux, C. *L'***économie** *royal des Lagides.* Bruxelles, 1939.

Price, J.J. **Jerusalem** *under Siege. The Collapse of the Jewish State 66-70 C.E.* Leiden: Brill, 1992.

Propp, V. *Morphology of the* **Folktale.** Bloomington, 1958.

Rahner, K. 'The One Christ and the Universality of Salvation.' In K. Rahner, *Theological Investigations* 16, pp.199-206.

Ricoeur, P. *The Rule of* **Metaphor.** *Multi-disciplinary Studies of the Creation of Meaning in Language.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978.

—— **Soi-même** *comme un autre.* Paris: Seuil, 1991.

Rius-Camps, J. *The Four Authentic Letters of* **Ignatius,** *the Martyr.* Rome: Pontifical Institute of Oriental Studies, 1980.

Roberts, C.H. & Skeat, T. *The Birth of the* **Codex.** London: for the British Academy by OUP, 1987.

Saldarini, A. ' "Form Criticism" of Rabbinic Literature.' *JBL* 96 (1977), pp.257-274.

Schiffman, L.H. *The* **Halakah** *at Qumran.* Leiden: Brill, 1975.

Schupphaus, J. *Die* **Psalmen** *Salomos. Ein Zeugnis jerusalemer Theologie und Frömmigkeit in der Mitte des vorchristlichen Jahrhunderts.* Leiden: Brill, 1977.

Segal, A.F. **Two Powers** *in Heaven. Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism.* Leiden: Brill, 1977.

Smith, M. *Tannaitic* **Parallels** *to the Gospels.* JBL Monograph Series, 6. Philadelphia, 1968.

—— "On the Problem of **Method** in the Study of Rabbinic Literature.' *JBL* 92 (1973), pp.112-113.

Soskice, J. **Metaphor** *and Religious Language.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.

Stacey, W.D. *Prophetic* **Drama** *in the Old Testament.* London: Epworth, 1990.

Suter, D.W. **Tradition** *and Composition in the Parables of Enoch.* Montana: Scholars' Press, 1979.

Taylor, A.E. **Plato***: The Man and his Work.* London: Methuen, 1960.

Thiemann, R.T. **Revelation** *and Theology: The Gospel as Narrated Promise.* Notre Dame, Indiana: University Press, 1985.

Thiselton, A.C. *The* **Two Horizons.** *New Testament Hermeneutics and Philosophical Description with Special Reference to Heidegger, Bultmann, Gadamer and Wittgenstein.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.

—— *New Horizons in* **Hermeneutics.** *The Theory and Practice of Transforming Biblical Reading.* London: Harper Collins, 1992.

Thompson, A. *Responsibility for* **Evil** *in the Theodicy of IV Ezra.* Montana: Scholars' Press, 1977.

Thompson, J.B. **Critical Hermeneutics**: *A Study in the Thought of Paul Ricoeur and Jürgen Habermas.* Cambridge: CUP, 1981.

Tilley, T.W. **Story** *Theology.* Wilmington: Glazier, 1985.

Tolhurst, W.E. 'On What a **Text** is and How it Means.' *British Journal of Aesthetics* 19 (1979), pp.3-14.

Trebilco, P. *The Jewish* **Communities** *in Asia Minor.* Cambridge: CUP, 1991.

Tristram, G. *The Survey of 'Western' Palestine. The* **Fauna** *and Flora of Palestine.* London, 1884.

Turner, V. **Dramas**, *Fields and Metaphors. Symbolic Action in Human Society.* Ithaca, New York: Cornell, 1974.

Vanhoozer, K.J. *Biblical* **Narrative** *in the Philosophy of Paul Ricoeur.* Cambridge: CUP, 1990.

Vansina, J. **Oral** *Tradition. A Study in Historical Methodology* (trans. H. Wright). Chicago: Aldine, 1965.

Vermes, G. '**Hanina** ben Dosa.' *JJS* 23 (1972), pp.28-50.

Vinson, R. 'A Comparative Study of the Use of **Enthymemes** in the Synoptic Gospels.' In *Persuasive Artistry. Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in honor of George A. Kennedy* (ed. D.F. Watson). Sheffield: JSNTS, 1991, pp.119-141.

Viviano, B. *Study as* **Worship**. *Aboth and the New Testament.* Leiden: Brill, 1978.

von Balthasar, U. **Herrlichkeit**. 6 Vols. Einsiedeln: Johannes, 1971

—— **Theodramatik**. 3 Vols. Einsiedeln: Johannes, 1973.

—— **Theologik**. 3 Vols. Einsiedeln: Johannes, 1985.

von Rad, G. **Wisdom** *in Israel* (trans. J.D. Martin). London: SCM, 1970.

Wallace-Hadrill, D.S. *Christian* **Antioch**: *A Study of Early Christian Thought in the East.* Cambridge: CUP, 1982.

Ward, G. **Barth, Derrida** *and the Language of Theology.* Cambridge: CUP, 1995.

Watts, F. & Williams, M. *The Psychology of* **Religious Knowing**. Cambridge: CUP, 1988.

Weinrich, H. 'Metapher.' In *Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie.* Bd. 5, Sp.1179-1186.

—— 'Über **Negationen** in der Syntax und Semantik.' In *Positionen der Negativität* (ed. H. Weinrich). Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1975.

—— **Sprache** *in Texten.* Stuttgart: Ernst Klett, 1976.

Wheelwright, P. *Metaphor and Reality.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1962.

White, K.D. *Roman Farming.* Ithaca, New York: Cornell, 1970.

Wilken, R.L. 'The Jews of **Antioch**.' *SBL* 1976 Seminar Papers (ed. G. MacRae). Montana: Scholars' Press, 1976, pp.67-74.

—— *John* **Chrysostom** *and the Jews.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.

Worgul, G.S. *From Magic to* **Metaphor**. New York: Paulist Press, 1980.

Zahary, T. *The Tradition of* **Eleazer** *ben Azariah*. Missoula: Scholars' Press, 1977.

INDEX OF MODERN AUTHORS

Achtemeier, P. 39
Agbanou, V.K. 425, 429
Aichinger, H. 29, 192
Aland, K. 292, 387
Allen, W. 13
Allison, D.C. 76, 174, 192, 267
Alon, A. 365
Anderson, H. 375
Anderson, J.C. 34, 38, 40, 84
Arai, S. 273
Arens, E. 108
Arndt, W. and Gingrich, F. 180, 270, 449
Aulen, G. 97
Aune, D.E. 39, 241
Aurelio, T. 62, 331, 446

Baasland, E. 88
Bacon, B. 32, 427
Bailey, K.E. 71, 120, 291-292
Balch, D.L. 189
Ballard, P.H. 403-404
Barlow, S.A. 67
Barnett, P.W. 267
Barr, J. 14
Barrett, C.K. 390
Barth, G. 204, 209, 214-215, 224, 245, 305-306, 320, 336, 381
Barton, J. 39
Bartsch, H.W. 326
Basser, H.W. 22, 216
Batey, R.A. 411
Bauckham, R. 429, 433
Bauer, D. 26-28, 31-33, 41
Bauer, J.B. 419
Baumbach, G. 27, 193, 198, 222, 305, 307, 417
Beare, F.W. 18, 245, 270, 439
Beavis, M. 160, 416, 475
Beck, B. 309
Behm, J. 258
Bergemann, T. 1, 12, 15, 19, 21, 173-177, 180, 186, 202, 360, 362, 448, 451, 465, 468, 477
Berger, K. 37, 63-64, 88-93, 97, 108, 276, 382
Bertram, G. 259, 403
Betz, H.D. 122, 166, 177, 182, 184, 186, 189, 204-205, 431, 439-440
Beyer, K. 10, 23, 69, 187, 216, 276, 278, 385, 519
Biser, E. 419
Bishop, E. 278
Black, M. 14, 20, 62, 387, 402
Blair, E. 125
Blass, F., Debrunner, A. & Funk, R.W. 277, 305-306, 340, 377, 445, 456, 468, 484
Bligh, P.H. 255
Blinzler, J. 419
Böcher, O. 179, 270-271
Bonnard, P. 17, 277, 368
Booth, R.P. 369
Borg, M.J. 72
Bornkamm, G. 7-8, 16-17, 181, 204, 250, 282, 286, 300, 364, 437, 446
Bovon, F. 309
Bowker, J. 258, 308, 382
Brandenburger, E. 31, 228-230, 236-238, 240, 243
Brändle, R. 264-265
Brandt, W. 247
Braun, H. 184
Brent, A. 23, 185
Breukelman, F. 217
Brightman, F.E. 476
Briscoe, H. 326, 372
Brock, S. 334
Broer, I. 208, 230, 247, 255, 418
Brown, R.E. 20, 30, 150, 239, 285, 407, 465
Brown, S. 96, 245, 310, 426
Bühl, F. 359
Bultmann, R. 36-37, 87-88, 108, 120, 187, 266, 361, 464
Burger, C. 364
Burkitt, F.C. 449
Burnett, F.W. 45, 435
Burney, C.F. 257
Burridge, R. 42-44, 165-167
Bussby, F. 278

Butler, B. 28, 290
Buzy, D. 273

Cadbury, H. 11
Cameron, P.S. 267
Campbell, K.M. 361
Caragounis, C.C. 174
Carlston, C. 191, 298, 360-361, 369, 388, 466
Carruthers, M. 40
Carson, D.A. 216, 232, 245, 252
Carter, W. 45, 137, 141, 157, 160, 413
Casey, M. 69, 233, 236-237, 240, 267-268, 343, 365, 432
Catchpole, D. 23-24, 110, 194, 227, 229, 238, 246, 257-258, 312-313, 316-317, 319-320, 355, 370, 406, 429-430,
Cathcart, K. 181
Cave, C.H. 325
Cerfaux, L. 247, 283, 302, 309
Charette, B. 41, 164
Chilton, B. 13-14, 69, 71, 174, 216
Christian, P. 247
Churchill, W. 66
Clingman, J. 103, 167
Collins, A. 241
Collins, J.R.F. 241, 432, 438
Conzelmann, E. 8, 209, 308, 406
Cope, L. 192, 205, 236-237, 246-247, 271, 282-283, 288, 324, 356, 364-366, 369-370, 413, 478
Cotter, W. 266-267, 269
Court, J. 247, 254, 262
Cranfield, C.E.D. 257
Crossan, D. 64, 72, 218, 320, 322, 324-325, 329, 346-349
Cullmann, O. 76, 361
Curtis, W.A. 419

Dahl, N. 327
Daniel, J. 385
Dauvillier, J. 347
Davids, P.H. 158
Davies, G. 10, 283
Davies, W.D. 22, 147, 179, 199, 359-360, 444
Davies, W.D. and Allison, D.C. 1, 8, 12-13, 18, 32, 73, 156, 174, 179-180, 205-206, 216, 218, 223, 276, 279, 282-283, 298, 307, 320, 329, 341, 347, 350, 354, 361, 365, 370, 382
Davies, M. (see also Pamment) 1, 44-45
Davison, J.E. 215, 307
De Boer, M. 217
De Goedt, M. 305, 334-335, 341, 343
De Kruijf, T. 382
De Jonge, M. 244
De Ru, G. 415, 420-421
De Sousa, R. 64
Dehandschutter, B. 372
Delobel, J. 23, 25
Denaux, A. 1
Derrett, D.J.M. 22, 45, 50, 70, 181, 199, 202, 216-217, 219, 276, 341, 347-348, 352, 364, 377, 379, 383, 385, 396, 404, 406, 409, 416, 418-419, 421, 427, 444, 446, 454, 460, 466, 469, 470, 472, 475
Deutsch, C. 192, 266, 270
Dewey, J. 368
Di Marco, A. 291, 450
Dibelius, M. 37
Didier, M. 480
Dietzfelbinger, C. 218, 413
Dillon, R.J. 380, 388, 403
Dodd, C.H. 62, 434, 446
Donaldson, T.L. 362
Donfried, K.P. 446, 453, 455
Downey, G. 49
Downing, G. 1, 30, 42, 130
Drögmüller, H.P. 321
Drury, J. 93, 108, 309, 376
Dschulnigg, P. 84-85
Dunn, J.D.G. 17, 192, 266, 271
Duplacy, J. 419
Dupont, J. 26, 204, 233, 247, 279, 282, 286, 299-300, 309, 324, 344, 346, 351-352, 361, 367, 427, 437, 480
Dupont-Sommer, A. 22

Ebeling, G. 100
Edwards, J.R. 294-296
Eichholz, G. 346, 418-419
Elliott, J.H. 50
Emerton, J.A. 69, 216

Ennulat, A. 29
Erlemann, K. 2, 97-98, 218
Evans, C.A. 308
Evans, C.F. 188

Faccio, P.H. 347
Faierstein, M. 267
Falk, Z.W. 22, 216
Fanning, B. 402, 453, 458
Farmer, W.R. 28, 275
Feldman, A. 323, 427, 444, 452
Fenton, J. 27-28, 247, 355
Feuillet, A. 337, 437, 446
Fiebig, P. 83, 146
Fiedler, M. 207
Fieger, M. 72, 275, 299, 321, 330, 352, 354-355, 361, 367, 372, 432
Filson, F. 283
Findlay, J.A. 247
Finnegan, R. 38
Fitzmyer, J.A. 78, 174, 267
Flusser, D. 81-83, 146, 184-185, 268, 283, 324, 329, 347, 354-355, 363, 399, 402, 419, 423, 441, 449, 461
Focant, C. 279
Foerster, W. 314
Ford, J.M. 444, 446
Förster, W. 480
Fränkel, E. 306
Frankemölle, H. 17, 32-33, 37, 41, 48, 198-200, 232, 245, 323, 365
Frei, H.W. 105
Freyne, S. 200
Friedrich, J. 30-31, 228-233, 235-236, 239, 243-245, 252-253
Fuchs, A. 29, 235, 271, 332, 334, 365, 517
Fuchs, E. 100
Funk, R. 63-64, 324-326, 330-332, 334, 349, 406, 422, 460, 462

Gadamer, H.-G. 63
Garland, D.E. 180, 197, 239, 372, 380, 386, 440, 479
Gaston, L. 9, 175, 230-232, 243, 256, 271, 293-294, 391, 477
Gatzweiler, K. 200, 237
Geddert, T.J. 227
Gereboff, J. 181, 421-422
Gerhardsson, B. 40, 282, 286
Gewalt, D. 250
Glombitza, O. 351, 403
Gnilka, J. 22, 223, 262, 283
Gnuse, R. 518
Goldin, J. 421
Gollinger, H. 227, 429, 437
Gonzalez, J.L. 158
Gooding, D.W. 211
Goody, J. 38
Goppelt, L. 257-258
Gottwald, N. 161
Goulder, M. 8-9, 30, 41, 83, 129, 173, 180, 184, 198, 205, 329, 346, 353, 355, 357, 360-362, 399, 405-406, 408, 412, 414, 416, 439, 444, 457
Grams, R. 237
Grässer, E. 75-76, 432, 437-438, 446, 474
Gray, S. 246
Grayston, K. 76, 198, 226, 236
Green, H.B. 17, 39, 216, 267, 474
Gregg, R. 275
Greimas, A. 126
Grindel, J. 192, 204
Gross, G. 247
Grundmann, W. 17, 352, 355, 367, 463
Gryglewicz, F. 419
Guillaumont, A. 352
Gundry, R.H. 12, 16, 174, 178, 180, 203, 212, 214, 230-232, 238, 243, 253, 256, 270, 274, 282-283, 293-294, 296, 306, 313-314, 317-319, 333, 335, 337-338, 340-341, 346-347, 360, 362, 374, 380-383, 386, 389, 391-392, 404, 406-408, 414-417, 448, 451, 454, 465, 468, 470, 475, 477

Haenchen, E. 251, 411
Hagner, D. 282, 311, 353, 359, 430
Hahn, F. 187, 245, 249, 287, 298, 309, 367, 401, 403, 405
Halverson, J. 38
Hamerton-Kelly, R.G. 237
Hanson, P. 241
Hare, D. and Harrington, D. 245-247
Harnack, A. 175, 177, 401
Harnisch, W. 97, 444
Hartin, P.J. 158

Hartman, L. 11, 52, 274, 292, 294, 296, 334, 451, 455, 482
Harvey, A. 74, 182
Haubeck, W. 417
Hauck, F. 361, 379
Havelock, E.A. 39
Hawkins, J. 8-9, 11, 13
Hedrick, C. 102, 299-300, 350
Heil, J. 431
Heininger, B. 50, 66, 71, 88, 95, 161, 188, 428
Held, H. 200, 237, 294
Henaut, B. 38
Hengel, M. 70, 365, 373, 377, 382-383
Herbert, G. 66
Herrenbrück, F. 225
Hertel, F. 419
Hezser, C. 420
Hickling, C.J. 198
Hiers, R.H. 22
Higgins, A.J. 426
Hill, D. 17, 179, 192, 206, 216, 246, 271, 341, 346, 355, 361, 366, 369, 379, 382, 400
Hoffmann, P. 97, 371, 375, 380, 474
Holdcraft, I.T. 470
Holmes, M. 27
Hommel, H. 216
Hooker, M.D. 96, 237, 283-284, 287, 324, 326, 336, 361, 367, 369, 375-376, 382, 384, 387, 390, 425
Hoppe, R. 415, 418
Horbury, W. 69
Horn, R.C. 212
Horrell, D. 37
Howell, D. 1, 34
Hubaut, M. 373-379, 388
Hubbard, B.J. 199, 336
Hughes, F.W. 91
Hummel, R. 237, 336, 364
Hunkin, J. 32
Hunziger, C.-H. 324
Hurst, L.D. 69
Hutton, W. 361

Jacobson, D. 352
Jensen, J. 369
Jeremias, J. 14, 21, 26, 60, 62, 68-69, 71-75, 78, 80, 107, 177, 179-180, 183, 219, 233, 235, 239, 270, 273, 304, 318, 324, 326, 332, 335, 343, 346-347, 352-353, 359, 380, 386, 391-392, 397, 401, 403, 406, 415, 427, 434, 448-450, 469, 472, 474-475
Johnson, L.T. 309, 322
Johnston, R.M. 91, 144-145
Jones, I.H. 16, 23, 26-27, 35, 51, 137, 217, 247, 268, 353, 366, 384, 440, 448, 450, 453, 455, 466, 479
Jónsson, J. 181, 268
Joüon, P. 473
Jülicher, A. 62, 64, 87, 175-176, 178, 317, 329-330, 449, 463, 471
Jüngel, R. 347, 352, 419

Kahmann, J. 277
Kamlah, J. 471
Käsemann, E. 276
Kearns, R. 302
Kee, A. 367
Kee, H.C. 49, 143, 221, 287, 309
Keith, K. 418
Kelber, W.H. 38, 95
Kilpatrick, G. 8, 197
Kingsbury, J. 2, 31-32, 45-47, 49, 190, 193, 199-200, 206, 232, 235, 253, 282, 285-286, 290, 300, 306, 322-323, 331-332, 341-342, 346, 355-356
Kirchgässner, A. 272
Kissinger, W.S. 359
Kjärgaard, M.S. 62, 66
Klauck, H.-J. 62-63, 78-79, 97, 284, 290, 297-298, 301, 306, 308-311, 322-324, 326, 361, 366-367, 369, 373, 379, 382, 384, 386, 425
Klein, H. 23, 42, 162, 185, 197, 208, 224, 250, 262, 264, 320, 392
Klijn, A.F.J. 195
Klostermann, E. 177
Knibbs, M.A. 240
Knowles, M. 164, 469
Köhler, W.-D. 39, 53, 512
Kossen, H. 279
Köster, H. 39
Krämer, M. 179

Kretzer, A. 48, 199, 209, 323, 335, 342-344, 388
Kuhn, K.G. 430, 463
Kulp, H. 348
Kümmel, W.C. 357
Künzel, G. 18, 22, 197, 198, 266
Kuss, O. 325

L'Epplattenier, C. 400
Ladd, G.E. 247
Lagrange, M.-J. 22
Lambert, G. 216
Lambrecht, J. 3, 99, 199, 212, 217, 226, 273, 277, 287, 309, 326, 398, 414, 442, 446, 466-467
Lampe, G. 382
Lampe, P. 174
Lange, J. 245
Lash, N. 68, 109
Lauer, S. 83
Laufen, R. 322-327
Leaney, A.R.C. 22, 184
Legg, S.C.E. 232, 292, 341, 373
Lemcio, E.E. 79, 301
Lindars, B. 267, 283, 382, 387
Lindemann, A. 275
Lindsey, R.L. 81
Linnemann, E. 108, 193, 346-347, 401, 403, 444, 448, 453, 455
Linton, O. 267
Lohmeyer, E. 352, 386
Lövestam, E. 214, 227, 429, 431, 434, 444, 448, 452-453
Löw, I. 427
Lowe, M. 371
Luck, U. 298
Lührmann, D. 91, 191, 227, 270, 273, 430, 464, 474
Lüthi, W. 402
Luz, U. 181, 188-189, 191-192, 200, 204, 206, 208, 245-246, 266-268, 270-271, 282-284, 286, 290, 298, 300, 313, 350, 357, 359, 361, 365, 382

M'Neile, A. 21, 247, 393
Maddox, R. 247-248
Madsen, I.K. 348
Magass, W. 348
Maisch, J. 446-447
Manék, J. 248
Manson, T.W. 191, 220, 301, 357, 446
Marbury, K. 283
Marcus, J. 96
Marguerat, D. 335, 359
Marin, L. 126, 133, 292
Marshall, I.H. 70, 75, 176, 194, 227, 266, 274, 326, 361, 379, 386-387, 403, 410, 429, 442, 444, 474, 479
Martinez, E.R. 200
Mason, S. 45, 154, 197, 202, 208
Massaux, É. 39
Mattila, S. 1, 241, 272, 337
Maynard-Reid, P.U. 158
Mazzaferri, F.D. 241
McArthur, H. 324, 326
McCabe, H. 68
McCall, M.H. 251, 428
McConnell, R. 192, 204, 283, 364, 382
McGaughy, L. 471, 475, 477-478
McKelvey, R. 386
McLaughlin, J. 285
Mealand, D. 348
Meeks, W.A. 161
Meier, J.P. 33, 185, 207, 245, 267, 359
Meinertz, M. 446
Ménard, J.-É. 299
Merkel, H. 391, 393
Merriman, E.H. 408
Metzger, B.M. 266, 334, 387, 449, 468, 479
Meyer, B.F. 72, 188, 405
Michaelis, C. 184, 394-395, 406
Michaelis, W. 403, 406
Michaels, J.R. 247, 394
Michel, O. 247, 392, 413
Milbank, J. 2, 104
Milik, J.T. 375
Minear, P. 179, 200, 440
Mitton, C.L. 419
Moloney, F. 413
Moore, H. 267
Morgenthaler, R. 253
Morrice, W.G. 355, 357, 372
Moule, C.F.D. 45, 188, 433
Moulton, J.H. 341, 377, 464
Moulton-Milligan, J.H. 466
Muddiman, J. 367

Mueller, J. 369
Muraoka, T. 222, 251, 338
Murdoch, I. 3, 47, 66, 103, 157
Murphy-O'Connor, J. 31, 211, 368
Mussner, F. 199, 267, 324, 374
Muszyński, H. 118, 185

Nagel, W. 367
Neirynck, F. 15, 19, 23, 26, 29-30, 175, 200, 234, 297, 326, 332, 334-335, 337, 347, 360, 362, 376, 380-381, 383, 388-389, 391, 404, 406-408, 417, 448, 451, 454, 465, 468, 470, 473-475, 477, 479
Nestle, E. 176, 292
Neusner, J. 72, 144-145, 197, 206, 364-365, 368-369, 410, 421, 441
Neyrey, J. 192, 323
Nolan, B.M. 192, 284, 369, 449

O'Neill, J.C. 372
Oesterley, W.O.E. 193
Ogawa, A. 14, 41, 207, 335, 359, 364, 366, 368
Ogden, G. 62, 361
Olofsson, F. 184-185
Oltshoorn, M.F. 181
Orton, D. 35, 149, 189-190, 195-198, 200, 205, 210, 302
Osborn, E. 45, 200
Overman, J.A. 143

Palmer, H. 401, 404
Pamment, M. 208
Patte, D. 126, 133, 201, 271, 292
Payne, P. 12, 298, 308
Pekáry, T. 374
Perrin, N. 64, 101
Pesch, W. 17, 22, 181, 227, 247, 287, 375, 379, 386
Petersen, W. 275, 277
Petrounias, E. 179
Petzoldt, M. 262
Piper, J. 25, 47, 130, 181, 194, 247, 259, 359
Pöhlmann, W. 466
Popkes, W. 208
Porter, S.E. 69
Powell, M.A. 1-2, 34-35
Prabhu, G.M.S. 31, 283, 474
Préaux, C. 374
Preisker, H. 421, 432
Price, J.J. 50
Pryke, E.J. 21
Przybylski, B. 208, 359, 362, 365, 392, 416
Puig i Tàrrech, A. 134-136, 445-447, 450-451, 458-459
Punge, 207
Puzicha, M. 258

Quispel, G. 232, 355

Rahner, K. 262
Räisänen, H. 283, 287
Ramsey, I.T. 62
Rehkopf, F. 14
Reiser, M. 77, 188, 217, 271-272
Rengstorf, K.H. 203, 403
Resenhöfft, W. 463
Richards, I.A. 62
Richards, W.L. 394
Riches, J. 105-106
Ricoeur, P. 63, 66, 98-100, 103, 134-136
Riesenfeld, H. 359
Roberts, C.H. 39
Robinson, J.A.T. 228, 247, 267, 337, 392
Robinson, J.M. 186
Rochais, G. 430
Rohde, J. 408
Rothfuchs, W. von 192, 283, 381
Rowland, C. 156, 277, 240-241
Rustad, J.O. 347
Rydbeck, L. 418

Saldarini, A. 3, 48, 142-143
Sand, A. 199, 208, 267
Sanders, E.P. 72, 384, 432
Sanders, E.P. and Davies, M. 44, 270
Sanders, J.A. 403-404, 410
Schaberg, J. 199
Schelkle, K.H. 247
Schenk, W. 15, 19, 21, 174-178, 180, 195, 200, 202-204, 209-210, 212, 214-215, 230-232, 234-235, 238-239, 243-244, 253, 256, 270, 273-275, 292-294, 296, 306, 313-314, 317-319, 333, 335, 337-338, 340-341, 346-347, 360, 362, 366,

376, 380-383, 388-389, 391-392, 404, 406-408, 414-418, 430-431, 443, 445-451, 453-455, 457-458, 465, 468, 470, 473-475, 477, 479
Schenke, L. 422
Schippers, R. 352
Schlatter, A. 178, 247, 360, 450, 470-471, 473
Schlier, H. 308
Schmid, J. 394
Schmidt, D. 276
Schnackenburg, R. 343
Schnider, F. 273, 422
Schniewind, J. 406
Schönle 266, 268, 270
Schottroff, L. 415, 419
Schrage, W. 48, 299, 321, 330, 352, 361, 372, 432
Schramm, T. 322
Schultze, B. 327
Schulz, S. 175-177, 181, 186, 193, 227, 247, 273-274, 322, 360-361, 371, 379, 408, 429, 431-433, 464, 466, 472-474, 477
Schürmann, H. 11, 14, 20-21, 32, 176, 233, 283, 290, 299, 309, 370, 429
Schüssler-Fiorenza, E. 22, 241, 243
Schwarz, G. 69, 360, 448, 451, 454
Schweizer, E. 17, 31, 49, 191, 199, 228, 230, 372
Scott, B. 4, 64, 71, 95, 101, 218, 275-277, 279, 298, 329, 347, 349, 357, 398, 404, 419, 422
Seitz, O. 459
Sellin, G. 450
Senior, D. 20, 32, 193, 199-200, 219, 339, 362, 382, 392, 407, 418, 430, 466, 468-469
Shakespeare, W. 66
Sheppard, J.B. 275, 299, 325, 353, 372, 388
Sider, J.W. 346
Sigal, P. 192, 278, 359, 364-366, 368
Silva, M. 198
Sim, D. 3, 45, 163, 406
Slater, T. 240
Smith, J.P. 335
Smitmans, A. 432
Snodgrass, K.R. 372, 387
Soskice, J. 64-65, 67, 72, 74, 105, 137, 200, 331
Souček, J. 360-362
Spicq, C. 383
Spies, O. 420
Stacey, W.D. 68-69, 86, 94, 108
Stanton, G. 2, 47-48, 186, 237, 247, 248, 283
Steck, O.H. 375
Stein, R.H. 108
Steinhauser, M.G. 84
Stendahl, K. 150, 204, 283, 381
Stern, D. 64
Strecker, G. 8, 33, 192, 198-200, 204, 209, 247, 274, 335, 341, 366, 381, 405, 477
Streeter, B.H. 54, 115
Strobel, F.A. 444, 446, 448, 453
Suter, D.W. 240, 251
Swaeles, R. 386, 406
Sweet, J. 233, 432
Syreeni, K. 216, 239, 242, 307

Taylor, A.E. 476
Telford, W. 315, 322, 336, 372, 390-391, 425-428, 431
Tevis, D.G. 9-11
Theissen, G. 37-38, 49, 50, 77, 86, 159, 267, 354, 360, 365
Thiemann, R.T. 1, 104
Thiering, B. 299
Thiselton, A. 3, 100, 126
Thoma, C. 83
Thompson, J.B. 300
Thompson, W. 14, 17, 22, 25, 33, 42, 193, 206, 211-213, 216, 221, 232, 364
Thrall, M. 213
Thysman, R. 2, 17, 107, 199, 226, 323
Tilley, T.W. 102
Tödt, H.E. 337, 343
Tolbert, M.A. 64
Toussaint, S. 288
Trebilco, P. 50, 143
Trilling, W. 17, 33, 198, 245, 283, 336, 343-344, 369, 379-380, 405-406, 477
Tristram, G. 365
Tuckett, C.M. 96, 284, 287, 302
Turner, C.H. 382

Turner, N. 51, 218, 340, 353, 479
Turner, V. 67, 157

Vaccari, A. 405
Vaganay, L. 26, 28
van Aarde, A.G. 62, 157, 207, 245, 404
van Elderen, B. 283
van Iersel, B.M.F. 382
van Roon, A. 374
van Segbroek, F. 283, 382
van Tilborg, S. 27, 193, 199-200, 235, 371, 409, 420
Vanhoozer, K.J. 47, 99
Vansina, J. 39-40
Vencovský, J. 364
Verseput, D.J. 192, 266
Via, D.O. 64, 126, 218-219, 226-227, 240, 242-243, 247, 260-263, 424, 471
Vincent, J.J. 63
Vinson, R. 234
Vischer, L. 73
Viviano, B. 185, 359, 362, 441
Vögtle, A. 344, 404-405, 408
von Balthasar, U. 63, 109
von Dobschütz, E. 198
von Gemünden, P. 2, 128, 428
von Rad, G. 180, 361

Walcot, P. 417
Walker, R. 33, 198, 205
Ward, G. 68, 105
Watts, F. 67
Weaver, D.J. 199
Weder, H. 63, 219, 273-275, 288, 290, 314, 319, 320, 322, 327-328, 346, 355-356, 398, 403-405, 416, 419, 443-444, 446, 464, 470, 480
Weinert, F.D. 466
Weinrich, H. 63, 97
Weiser, A. 405, 409, 429, 433, 435-436, 438, 440-441, 443, 463, 466, 471-473, 477, 479-480
Weiss, J. 247
Wenham, D. 290, 303
Wernberg-Møller, P. 22, 184
Werner, A. 248
Westermann, C. 83, 85-88, 108
Wheelwright, P. 62, 64
White, K.D. 298, 374
Wilch, J.R. 14
Wilckens, U. 380
Wilcox, M. 174
Wilder, A.N. 64, 248, 298
Wilken, R.L. 50
Wilkens, W. 205, 282-283, 300, 347.
Williams, M. 67
Williams, J.G. 2, 100
Wilson, J.P. 178
Winandy, J. 247
Winterbotham, R. 466
Wolf, E. 379
Wong, K. 160, 189, 368
Wood, J.E. 382
Worgul, G.S. 67
Wrege, H.-T. 26, 73, 175-177, 180-181, 187, 350, 359, 361, 468
Wright, N.T. 1, 93, 102, 107, 131-132, 376,
Wuellner, W. 356

Yates, J.E. 77, 270-271
Young, B.H. 73, 82-83, 186-187

Zaphiris, G. 341
Zeller, D. 181, 205, 267
Zerwick, M. 466
Ziesler, J.A. 199, 270
Zimmermann, H. 17

INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

with statistical entries in bold type

ἀγαθός 192, 405, 408, 415 n.303, 418
ἀγαπητός 381f
ἄγγελος **231 n.205(iii)**
ἀγοράζω 136, **347 n.253**,.456
ἀγρός 313 n.117, **313 n.118**, 323 n.140(3), 334f
ἀδελφός 223, 246f
ἀδιακρίτως 258
αἴρω 285, **388 n.184**, 418, 477 n.228
αἰών 336 n.219
ἄκανθα 303f
ἀκολουθέω 209, 235 n.208, 391,451
ἀκούω 117, 176 n.3(ii), 285, 341, 372
ἀλλήλων 223, 252 n.259
ἄλλος 289, 303 n.80, 372, **468 n.198**
ἅλς 360f
ἀλώπηξ 364 n.47
ἅμα **315 n.118(8)**
ἀμήν 23, 24, **234 n.206**, 234 n.209, 392, 434f, 443
ἀμπελών 371, 375 n.114, 385, 392 n.212, 423
ἀμφότεροι 318 n.215(iii.6), 367
ἀνὰ μέσον 318 n.125(iii.3)
ἀνάκειμαι 406 n.274(2)
ἀνάπαυσις 270
ἄνθρωπος 273, 276, 312 n.111, **314 n.118.4(ii)**, 360, 393, 464
ἀνοίγω 79, 180, 443
ἀνομία 141, 214 n.135, 306 [n.93], 341
ἄνυδρος 270
ἄξιος **404 n.262**
ἀπαγγέλλω 20 n.19
ἀπάντησις 429, 444, 454, 459
ἀπέρχομαι **295 n.48**, 391, 391 n.201, 407 n.274(4), 412 n.291, 456
ἀπό 14, 32, 140, 318, **416 n.302**
ἀποδημέω **376 n.120**, 464f.
ἀποδίδωμι **414 n.300**, 466 n.189
ἀποδοκιμάζω 387 n.174
ἀποθήκη 315 n.121(1)
ἀποκρίνομαι **335 n.214**, 391, 417 n.313, 443, 455
ἀποκτείνω 403
ἀπόλλυμι 274 n.332, 277 n.343, 385
ἀποπνίγω 303
ἄρα 25 n.30, 26 n.32, 212 n.133
ἀργός **416 n.309**
ἀργύριον 469
ἄριστον 400f
ἄρχομαι 32 n.37, **293 n.46**, 416 n.302, 423
ἄσβεστος 29
ἀσθενής 255, 261
ἀτιμάζω 379
αὐστηρός 471 n.211
ἀφίημι 222f., 278, 318 n. 125(ii.4), 332 n.198, 332f, **333 n.204**
ἀφωρίζω 252 n.258

βαπτίζω 198
βάρος 418 n.327, 423
βαστάζω 418 n.324
βασιλεία 137, 138, 193, 199 n.88, 202, 236, 266ff., 305 n.84(i), 316f., 335, 371, 388, 392 n.208, **402**, **413**
βασιλεύς 236f
βλαστάνω 312 n.111
βλασφημία 176 n.3, 369
βρυγμός 341, 408

γάμος 400, 402, 457
γάρ 27 n.32, 118, 183 n.31, 269, 289 n.30, 425f., **451 n.142**, 464 n.183.
γενεά 270
γῆ **360**, 363
γίνομαι 10, 219 n.163, 276, **277 n.341(ii)**, 325 n.161
γινώσκω 209f., 227, 302, 426f., 437
γογγύζω 418 n.329, 423
γοιυπετέω 296 n.48
γράφω 234, 464

γραμματεύς 195ff.
γρηγορέω 227, 429, **430 n.29**, 434ff, 444, 445, 460

δανεῖον 217 n.148
δέ 194 n.75, **230**, 289 n.30, 305 n.84, 426 n.3
δεῖ 222, **479 n.233**
δένδρον 326
δεξιός 252ff
δεῦτε **256 n.269**, 406
δέχομαι 26
δέω 23 n.21, 215 n.140, **316 n.125(i.3)**
δή 306 n.85
διά 193, 256, 388
διὰ τί; **296 n.48**
διὰ τοῦτο 388, **192 n.75**
διάβολος **307 n.91**
διακονέω 261
διαλλάσομαι 20 n.19
διαλογίζομαι 473 n.218
διαλογισμός 369 n.82
διασκορπίζω 476, **476 n.226**
διδάσκω 198, 210, **293 n.46**
δίδωμι 285, 297, 302
δίκαιος 341 n.227, 416 n.310
δικαιοσύνη 248 n.244, 392
διχοτομέω 160, 439f
διψάω 261
δοκέω 273, 391, **417 n.312**
δόξα 229, **230 n.205(ii)**, 233 n.205(iv)
δοῦλος 202, 397, 409, 434f, 479
δύναμαι **362 n.3**, 366
δύναμις 136, 463, 470 n.205
δύο 393 n.213

ἐάν 158, 276f
ἑαυτοῦ **385 n.164**, 449, 451
ἐγγίζω 378
ἐγγύς 427
ἐγείρω 445, **454 n.163**
ἔδει 479 n.233
ἐθνικός 152, 224
ἔθνος 155, 229, 245ff, 248ff, 335, **389 n.185**
εἶπεν **473 n.218**
εἰς 249, 292 n.46, 303 n.80, 325, 393
εἷς 217 n.153, 277, 353 n.287
ἕκαστος 136, 223, **466 n.189**
ἐκβάλλω 203
ἐκδίδωμι 27 n.32, 377 n.120(ii)
ἐκεῖ 23 n.22, 341, **407 n.274(4)**
ἐκεῖθεν 293 n.46
ἐκεῖνος 14, 292, **417 n.315**, 435, 453
ἐκκλησία 23 n.21, 48f, 142f, 156, 159, 216
ἐκλεκτός 381, 409
ἐκριζόω 315 n.118(9), 321 n.130
ἐκφύω 427 n.11
ἔλαιον 447-452
ἐλάχιστος 246f, 255
ἐλέγχω 18, 22 n.21
ἐλεέω 222, 258
ἔλεος 158, 248 n.244, 365, 366
ἔμπροσθεν 229, **238 n.218**, 239, 360 n.14
ἐν 14, **231**, 294, **468 n.201**
ἔνδυμα **406 n.274(1)**
ἐνδύω **406 n.274(1)**
ἐνώπιον 239 n.218
ἐξέρχομαι **292 n.46**, 295 n.48, 449
ἔξω 293 n.46
ἐπάνω **362 n.31**
ἐπί 117, 174 n.2, 244 n.231, 275 n.332(v)
ἐπι-compounds 210, 284, **317 n.125(ii)**, 376 n.118
ἐργάζομαι 180, **415 n.302**, 421 n.333, 468 n.200
ἐργάτης **415 n.302**, 423
ἔργον 111, 266, **415 n.302**, 466
ἐρεύγομαι 79, 283
ἔρημος 227
ἐρίφιον 255
ἔριφος 252 n.260
ἔρχομαι 175 n.3, 230, 256f, 333, **333 n.204**, 416 n.308, 456
ἐρῶ **255 n.268**, 319 n.125(ii.8)
ἔσχατος 138, **383 n.154**, 394ff, 413, 417 n.316
ἑταῖρος 406 n.274(5), 413 n.293
ἕτερος 397f, **468 n.198**
ἕτοιμος 408 n.276, 431, 445, 457
εὐδοκέω 381 n.148
εὑρίσκω 275ff, 277 n.341(iii), **347**

n.250

ἔφη 314 n.118(3), **472 n.218**
ἐχθρός 307, 314 n.118(4)
ἕως **318 n.125(ii.7)**, 335, 415 n.302, 423
ἔχω 217 n.150, 346

ζητέω 278
ζιζάνιον 325 n.157, 334
ζύμη 328f

ἤδη **408 n.276**, 427
ἥλιος 341 n.228
ἡμέρα 14, **292 n.46**, 431

θεάομαι 297, **406 n.274(6)**
θέλω 158, 314 n.118(3), 315 n.118(7), 365, 393 n.211
θερισμός 312 n.111, 313 n.115, 365
θεριστής 232 n.205(iii), 409
θέρος 426f
θησαυρός 192, 346 n.246
θρόνος 229, 233 n.205(iv)
θύρα 181, 427, 443, 457
θυσία 365

ἰατρός 365ff
ἴδιος 21, 284, 463, **465 n.185**, 470
ἰδού 289 n.30, 426 n.3, 427
ἵνα 297 n.49
ἵστημι **253 n.261**, 347 n.249, 408 n.274(4) 415 n.307, 423

καθεύδω 312 n.111, **430 n.33**, 445
κάθημαι **293 n.46**
καινός 151, 204, 358
καιρός 14, 376ff
κακός 386 n.168, 435, 450
κακῶς 386 n.168
κάλαμος 268
καλέω 400f, 409, 423, 467 n.196
καλός 315 n.119
καρδία 140, 223, 369
καρπός 297f, 312 n.111, 376ff
κατά 136, 416 n.311
κατ' ἰδίαν 21 n.20, 284, 466 n.189
καταβαίνω 178 n.5
καταβολή 79, 302
κατακαίω 316 n.121(3), 319 n.125(ii.10)
κατάκειμαι 407 n.274(2)
κατασκηνόω 325 n.170
καύσων 418 n.328
κεῖμαι **362 n.31**
κερδαίνω 468
κεφαλαιόω 379
κλάδος 326 n.170, 427
κλαυθμός 341, 408
κληρονομέω 383 n.157, 384
κληρονόμος 383f
κλοπή 369
κόσμος 335 n.215, 342f, 360
κραυγή 444, 454
κρατέω 223, 408 n.279
κρίσις 246 n.238
κρύπτω 79, 302, 330, 346, 346 n.248
κύριος 158, 187, 377, 385, 392, 393 n.210, 423f, 431, 438, 443f, 458, 473

λαλέω 210, **296 n.48**
λαμβάνω 323 n.140(2), 418, **448 n.117**, 450, 477 n.228(3)
λαμπάς 448ff
λέγω 24 n.24, **233 n.206**, 255 n.268, 313 n.118(6), 334 n.210, 400 n.228(ii), 443, 455
ληνός 374 n.109
λιθοβολέω 380 n.137
λόγος 117, 186, 305, 309, 479 n.232
λοιπός 458
λυπέω 220
λύω 23 n.21, 216 n.140

μαθητεύω 198, 201, 209
μαθητής **200 n.91**, 249, 334
μακάριος 434
μακροθυμέω 119, 158
μακρός 466 n.191
μαλακός 268
μᾶλλον 136
μέν 253 n.262, 289 n.30, 323 n.140(4), 380, 466
μέσος 453, 459
μετά + Accus. **474 n.221**
μετά + Genitive 20 n.19, **232 n.205(iii)**, 451

n.141
μετά-compounds 392 n.203
μεταμέλομαι 382 n.154, 392 n.203, 394
μεταξύ 22 n.20
μήποτε 284, **314 n.118(5)**
μικρός 18, 32, 246 n.240, 247 n.243, 267, 323
μιμνήσκομαι 234 n.206
μισθός **414 n.301**, 419
μισθόω 414 n.301, 419 n.333
μόνος 21
μυστήριον 96, 302
μωραίνω 361
μωρός 180 n.10(ii), 436, 450, 455

ναί 189, 289 n.30
νεκρός 454f
νηστεύω 26 n.32
νομίζω **416 n.312**
νυμφίος 365, 449
νύξ 445, 447, 453, 459
νυστάζω 453

ξένος 261

ὅθεν 475 n.223
οἶδα 210 n.131
οἰκία 193, 333
οἰκοδεσπότης 138, **202 n.98**, 373, 415 n.305, 423, 443
οἰκοδομέω 174 n.2, 375, 387 n.174
οἰκουμένη **335 n.215**
οἶνος 365ff
ὀκνηρός 479
ὀλίγος 409
ὅμοιος 177 n.4, 202, 289 n.30, 323 n.140(1), 346
ὁμοίως 380 n.145
ὁμοιόω 117, 137, 177 n.4, 316 317 n.125(4), 402, 447
ὄνομα 248 n.243, 249
ὀπίσω 20 n.19, 256 n.269
ὅπου 475 n.223
ὅπως 297 n.48
ὀργίζω 217, 222
ὄρος 362 n.31
ὀρύσσω 375 n.112
ὅσος 24 n.24, 346, **366 n.65**
ὅστις 117, 175 n.3, 285, 402
ὅταν 230 n.205, 323 n.140(5), 325, 340 n.221
ὅτε 10, **317 n.125(i.2)**, 356, 378 n.126
ὅτι **234 n.206**
οὐδέποτε 444
οὐρανός 24 n.24, 137, 138, 199 n.88, 316f, 316 n.125, 388
οὖν 332, **339 n.221**,426 n.3
οὗτος 117, **186 n.46**, 288 n.30, 335
οὕτως 138, 276 n.341, 337 n.220, 340, **340 n.222**, 426 n.3, 434, 464, 466 n.189
οὐχί **274 n.332**, 276 n.341, 313 n.118(1), 417 n.318
ὀφειλή 222
ὀφείλω 218 n.154
ὀφθαλμός 18, 417 n.319
ὄχλος 235 n.208, 332 n.198, 333

παιδίον 26
παλαιός 151, 204, 358, 367
παλιγγενεσία 45 n.76, 208, 234 n.207
πάλιν 194, 289f, 293, 294, **381 n.146**, 400 n.228(i)
παρά 293, **293 n.46**
παραβολή 79, 95, 96, 283, 288ff, 294ff, 305, 334, 369f, 372, 400 n.228(iii), 426
παραγίνομαι **477 n.228**
παραδίδωμι 222, 465 n.186
παρακαλέω 217 n.155
παρατίθημι 312 n.113
παρθένος 449-458
παρουσία 336f esp. n.219
πᾶς 117f, 175 n.3, 231 n.205(iii), 289 n.30, 356, 453
πεινάω 261
πειράζων **307 n.91**
πειρασμός 430
πενθέω 366 n.60
περί **418 n.323**
περισσεύω 285
περιτίθημι **376 n.117**
πετεινόν 181, 365 n.48
πέτρα 117, 173f, 184f
πιστεύω **392 n.207**
πίστις 209 n.131
πιστός 183 n.31, 480 n.235

πλανάω 18, 214 n.135, 274, 277f
ποιέω 117, 215, 325, 385
ποιμήν 252
ποῖος 431 n.41
πολύς **294 n.47,** 413, 474 n.221
πονηρός 222 n.167, 270, 306, **306 n.90**, 335, 370, 405, 408, 417
πορεύομαι 20 n.19, 136, 256, **256 n.269**, 274 n.332, 278, 291 n.46, 391 n.201, 456, 466
πορνεία 27 n.32, 369 n.82
πότε; 260, 431 n.41
πούς 18
πραγματεύομαι 466 n.192
πραΰτης 248 n.244
προάγω 392 n.209
πρόβατον 252f, 255, 277
πρός 136, 297
προσδοκάω 437
προσέρχομαι 244 n.231, 293 n.48, **294 n.48**, 313 n.114(ii), 333f, 376 n.118, 391, 477 n.228(1),
πρόσκαιρος 308 n.100
προσκαλέω 220 n.166
προσκυνέω 218 n.155, 296 n.48
προσπίπτω 178 n.5
πρωΐ 417 n.322
πρῶτον 20 n.19, 312, **319 n.125(ii.9)**
πρῶτος 138, **396 n.220**, 397, 413
πῦρ 29, **341 n.225**
πύργος 375
πωλέω 20 n.19, 136, 347 n.253, 456

σαγήνη 356
σατανᾶς 20 n.19, 307 n.91
σάτον 330 n.192
σβέννυμι 455
σῖτος 312 n.111, 316 n.121(2)
σκανδαλίζω 18, **214 n.135**
σκάνδαλον 18, 141, 277, 342
σκληρός 471 n.211
σκορπίζω 243 n.231
σοφός 195 n.77
σπείρω 46, 296 n.49, 325
σπέρμα 315 n.119
σπλαγχνίζομαι 258
στατήρ 469 n.204
στόμα 79, 369ff
στρέφω 26 n.31
συλλέγω 313, 316 n.121(1)
συμπνίγω 303
συμφωνέω **417 n.317**, 423
συν-compounds 318 n.125(ii.5), 367, 417
συνάγω 233, **243 n.231**, 315 n.121(1), 356, 476, 477
συναγωγή 48, 243 n.231
συναίρω 479
συνίημι 118, 189, 209ff, 290 n.30, 358
συντελεία 190 n.61, 336 n.219
σχολάζω 270

ταπεινόω 225 n.180, 366 n.66
τέκνον 266
τέλειος 158, 236 n.209
τελέω 10
τελώνης 152, 224
τότε 14, 32, 137, 220 n.165, **232 n.205(iv)**, 255 n.268, 306, 317 n.125(i.2), 332, 425, 426 n.3, 448

ὑβρίζω 403
υἱός 383, **393 n.214**, 402
υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου 235 n.209, 268, 342, 464
ὑπάντησις 444
ὑπάγω 20 n.19, 391, 412, 466 n.191
ὑπάρχω 20 n.19, 347 n.252, 465 n.187
ὕστερον 371, **382 n.154**, 393ff, 457

Φαρισαῖοι 153, 195f
φημί **314 n.118**, 472 n.218
φραγμός 374
φράζω 334f
φρόνιμος 180 n.11, 182, 436, 450
φυλακή 219, 429
φύλλον 427 n.11
φωνή 444

χαίρω 277, **346 n.249**
χαρά **346 n.249**, 473 n.219
χείρ 18

χόρτος 312 n.111
χρονίζω 76, 436-439, 452
χρόνος 14, **474 n.221**
χώρα 466 n.191

ψευδομαρτυρία 369

ὧδε **407 n.274(7)**
ὥρα 14, 419, 437
ὡς **337 n.220**, 463
ὡσαύτως 371, **380 n.144**, 391, 412 n.291
ὥσπερ 194, **338 n.220**, 463
ὥστε 297

INDEX OF REFERENCES TO THE MAIN MATTHEAN PASSAGES

Passages in bold are extended treatments

5:13-16	Salt, Light, City	13, 88, 128, 181, 265, **359-364**
7:24-27	The Two Houses	82, 89, 91, 116-122, 143-148, **173-189**, 217, 265, 271, 280, 306, 411, 435-436, 442-443, 447, 450, 455, 477, 479-480
9:14-17	Doctor, Wine, Bridegroom	27, 120-121, 154, **364-368**, 449
11:16-19	Children's Games	89, 110, 120, 193, 202, 237, **266-269**, 280, 371
12:25-29	Beelzebub Parables	111, 120, 139, **192-193**, 199, 213, 270-272, 393
12:43-45	The Unclean Spirit	27, 111, 120, 220, 266, **270-273**, 280, 285, 308, 396
13	The Chapter of Parables	7, 10-11, 14, 31, 33, 46-47, 79, 95-96, 107, 110, 112-116, 122, 127-128, 149-150, 153, 155, 199-201, 206, 211, **282-358**
13:1-9	The Sower	56-57, 78-79, 112-113, 128, 157, 194, 199, 253, 285-290, **292-301**, 302-306, 309-311, 320, 355, 370, 372, 400, 470-471
13:18-23	The Interpretation of the Sower	194, 209, 253, 288, **301-311**, 313, 316, 332, 339, 341, 345, 370
13:24-30	The Tares	31, 46, 79, 107, 112-113, 128, 160, 163, 177, 203, 288, 304-305, 307, **311-322**, 327, 332, 340, 345, 348-349, 356-358, 372, 391, 430, 454, 467
13:31-32	The Mustard Seed	45-46, 64, 112, 177, 183, 199, 253, 287, 289, 312-313, 319-320, **322-328**, 349, 352, 372, 468
13:33	The Leaven	46-47, 64, 112, 140, 177, 183, 199, 253, 289, 313, 315, 319-320, 322-324, **328-331**, 349, 352, 372, 468
13:36-43	The Interpretation of the Tares	31, 89, 107, 128, 141, 160, 193, 197, 199, 214-215, 232, 237, 248, 251, 288-289, 303-305, 310, 313, 315-316, 320, **331-345**, 355, 357, 393, 406, 429
13:44	The Treasure	20, 72, 127, 141, 158, 202, 289, 313, 315, 320, 330, **346-351**, 352, 354-355, 357
13:45-46	The Pearl	158, 194, 202, 289, 313, 315, 320, 347, 349, 350, **351-355**, 357, 391, 467
13:47-50	The Net	31, 160, 194, 202, 232, 252, 290, 305, 313, 315, 320, 343, 345-346, **355-358**, 405-406, 408, 440

13:52	The Householder	116-117, 118, 120-121, 143, 149-151, **189-211**, 280, 286-288, 290, 358, 367
15:11-20	Pictures and a "Parabole"	27, 89, 95, 128, 154, 207, 210, **368-371**, 428
18	The Fourth Discourse	7, 17-19, 23, 26-27, 30, 110, 117, 140, 146, 151, 156, 168, 193, 200, 213-216, 277-279
18:11-14	The Sheep	17, 19, 27-28, 32, 72, 87, 91, 96, 121, 151, 156, 168, 225, 247, 266, **273-280**
18:21-35	The Unforgiving Servant	17, 19, 22, 24, 87, 117, 119-121, 133, 140, 146, 148, 160, 183, 195, 208, **211-226**, 261, 278, 339, 370, 391, 456, 479, 481
20:1-16	The Workers	10, 20, 89, 106, 115, 138, 159, 194, 202, 253, 317, 391, 400, 407, **412-424**, 467
21:28-32	The Two Sons	20, 89, 113, 121, 148, 194, 199, 267, 274, 295, 371, 379-380, 382, 388-389, **390-399**, 409, 420, 458, 468
21:33-46	The Tenants	3, 27, 95, 113, 131-132, 136, 154, 159, 194, 199, 203, 254, 287, **371-390**, 395, 399, 400, 409, 420
22:1-14	The Feast	31, 72, 74, 89, 96, 105, 114, 139-140, 154, 160, 163, 177, 194, 219-220, 254, 256, 286, 317, 340, 371, 391, 393, **399-412**, 419, 457, 460, 477
24:32-33	The Fig Tree	7, 95, 137, 158, **425-428**, 480. On Mt 21:18-22 see 390. On Lk 13:6-9 see 320, 322.
24:42-44	The Thief	115, 137, 194, 227, 339, 393, **429-433**, 435, 437, 442-445, 458, 462
24:45-51	The [Two] Servants	76, 114, 137, 148, 156, 160, 180, 194, 212, 227, 340, 429, 432, **433-443**, 444-445, 458, 460, 462, 466, 480
25:1-13	The Ten Young Women	31, 76, 82, 89, 114, 134-137, 180, 194, 227, 320, 339, 383, 391, 402, 423, 429, 431-432, 435-437, **443-462**, 481
25:14-30	The Talents	70, 80, 89, 137, 160, 194, 222, 227, 232, 251, 255, 285, 301, 317, 340, 346, 367, 391, 397, 441, **463-480**, 481
25:31-46	The Sheep and the Goats	79, 87, 93, 105, 116, 119-122, 126, 128, 137, 143, 153, 156, 160, 183, 189, 194, 199, 207, 220, **226-265**, 280, 337, 342, 360, 362, 391, 403, 473, 476, 481

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

Acts of John 350
Acts of Peter 350
Aeschylus 179, 262
Aesop's Fables 47, 130, 178, 203, 267, 378, 392, 452, 469, 473
African theology 103
Allegory (*see* Form Criticism) 58, 60, 62, 79, 94, 97
  Allegorese 78-79, 311
  Allegorization 61, 77
  Literary Allegory (modern) 374
  Allegorical 61, 78, 128
  Historical allegory 93-94, 131-132
  see Vision Interpretation
Alliteration 146, 178, 184, 257, 435
Ambiguity
  see Paradox, Metaphor, Evocative, Allegory
Anger, 158, 180
Amoraim 144, 439
Analogy 67
Anarthrous Imperatives 20, 256
Angels 44
Anticipations 104
Antigonus 145
Antitheses 141
Antioch on Orontes 49-51, 148, 150, 158-159, 187
Aphorism 47, 74, 95, 109, 130, 167, 173, 181, 182, 351, 399
Apocalyptic
  Apocalyptic garment 163
  Apocalyptic vision 94, 240-243, 327
    of an enthroned judge 242
  Apocalypse, definition of 240-242
  Apocalypticism, definition of 242-243
  Apocalypse of Elijah 89, 91
  Apocalyptic figures 240
  Apocalyptic world view 153, 243
  millenarian apocalyptic 142, 153
  Apocalyptic language 190, 243, 344, 406, 449
  'inside' and 'outside' 285
Apostasy 18
Aqiba 144, 148
Aramaic 52, 68, 146, 174, 203, 354, 361, 446-451
Archelaus 70
Aristophanes 468
Ascetics 156, 268, 355
Assonance 146, 435, 479
Audience involvement 68, 287
Aurality 36, 38
Authenticity 101
Author's intention 3, 164, 168
Authority 17-18, 111, 114, 118-120, 125-126, 141, 151-152, 185, 187, 399, 439
  Authoritarianism 140, 165, 345
Autonomy of text 92-93, 219, 299
  see Structuralism

Babrius 47, 225, 367
Baptism 198-199, 215, 266, 381
Baraita 144
Beatitudes 128, 141, 248, 360, 434, 438
ben Abuyah 143-148
ben Zakkai 96, 144, 147, 154, 365, 368, 410
ben Hyrcanus 144-147, 154, 197, 410
ben Sirach 188, 195, 198, 210, 214, 341
Beelzebub 77, 111, 113, 270-271
Binary oppositions 271, 317-319
Binding 22-23, 216
  see loosing
Biography 38, 43-45, 82, 123, 164-169
Birth Narratives 150
Blasphemy 18
Blessing 132, 138-139, 470
Boundary situations 67

Capitalism 140, 476
Characterization 34, 165
Chiasmus 33, 289, 291, 310, 435, 450
  see Rhetoric
Children 138, 152, 155-156, 168, 229, 269, 372, 390
Christ 123, 142, 149, 156, 164-165, 187, 382, 387, 411
  Christology 79, 151, 153, 216, 236, 240, 242, 250, 260, 265, 301, 323, 342, 350, 382, 387, 393-394, 432
  see Messiah

Christian presence 51
Chronicler 41
Church 128, 137, 154, 439
  security established 216
  see Ekklesia
Chrysostom 153, 264, 411, 478
Cicero 259
Citations in Early Church Fathers 39-40, 53-55
Classicism 25, 175, 176, 386, 393
Clauses
  Conditional 19, 23, 276
  Causal 337
Clement of Rome 39, 222
Clement of Alexandria 103, 350
Coherence 16, 155
  see consistency
Comedy 50, 71, 160
  see Plautus
Commandments
Concepts 104
Communication 84
  see Prophet
  see Rabbis
Community 17, 128
  of readers 123
  of interpreters 149-150
  community offences 18
  community discipline 345, 406
  urban communities 49, 148
  Christian 50-51, 149
  house community 48
  congregation 23
  community officials 180, 277
  incorporation into community 198, 202, 282
  group dynamics 150, 250
Compositional techniques 1, 19, 84-85
  fusion 80
  conflation 28
Concluding formulae 116-117, 120-122, 186, 189
Conservation 169
Consistency 19, 25, 162, 174, 244
Corpus mixtum 135, 305
Cosmology 185, 335
Covenant 199, 279, 354
Criteria
  of judgment 126, 153, 257-263
  their validity 259
Cross 162
  of Christ 18
Crowds 235
Cult 147
  validating use of law 192
Culture 61, 102, 130, 150
  culture and education 70
  cultural attitudes 109, 140-141
Cynics 130

Dead metaphor 330-331
Death 115, 135, 216, 444-445, 446-459, 462
Deuteronomy 41, 136, 164, 179, 232, 299, 406, 410, 470
Deviancy theory 2, 142, 150, 153
Dialogue 135-136, 144, 461-462
Didache 155, 214, 254-255, 277, 432
Disciple 138-139, 141, 149, 156, 331, 365
  discipleship 96, 123, 137, 188-189, 191, 200-202, 268, 307, 331
  the narrative approach 201
  the discursive approach 201
  relation to Kingdom 138, 202
  the Twelve 236
Discipline 24, 113, 121, 140, 158, 162, 223
  see Community
Discrepancies 57
Dittography 190
Divorce 27, 369
Double aspect terms 67
Dualism 185, 311
  ethical shape 272

Ecclesiastes 410
Ecclesiasticus 22
  Ecclesia 23, 49, 142, 151, 156
  see congregation
Ecclesiology 18, 151, 250, 323, 438, 440-441
Emotion 64, 89, 217
Enochic traditions 229, 240, 252-255, 264
Enthymeme 234
Epic 118-119, 121, 132, 146-147, 224, 408, 423, 447, 459
  extended epic 132-133, 138, 218, 225, 412, 422-424, 470
Epictetus 83, 89, 129, 203
Epicurus 83, 268
Epigram 419
Epistles of Ignatius 201, 329, 464
Epistle of Barnabas 214, 387
Epistle of James 158

Epitome 122-123, 166
Eschatology 57, 70, 74, 75-76, 97, 241
  eschatological woes 76, 267
  eschatological discourse 122, 189, 227
  eschatological motifs 119
  end time 429-438
  Zion eschatology 362
  see Parousia
Ethics 93, 118, 156
  justification for ethics 123, 189
Euripides 67, 212
Evil
  battle with God's Spirit 111, 193, 199, 271
  various forms 271, 306-307, 329, 371
  separation from good 321, 405
  see Beelzebub
Evocative language 46, 118, 211, 225, 323, 351
Exploitation 157-158

Fable 66, 83, 90, 92-93, 111, 130, 135, 143, 145, 184, 188, 217, 270, 378
Faith 138, 372, 431
  little faith 201
Family, of God 270
Fasting
  glad fasting 366
Fear 151, 299-300, 471-479
Fiction 47, 60, 66, 80, 95, 263, 273
Flashback 104, 232, 244, 257, 380
Folktale 59, 61, 217
  folktale motifs 148
Forgiveness 18, 118, 140, 151
Form Criticism 37, 57-58, 85-95
  apothegm 27, 91, 120, 266, 269, 272
  diachronic 37, 58, 86
  synchronic 37, 86, 89
  functionalist 37, 86
  parabel 88
  example story 88-89
  similitude 88, 132, 277, 323, 428
  mashal 87, 143-145, 263
  narratio 89, 336
  discursio 90
  allegoria 90-91
  gattung 147
  ma'aseh 145
Formula Quotations 10, 150, 283-286, 288
Formulae 10, 14, 186, 213, 274, 294-296, 334-335, 381, 455
Freedom 17-18, 119, 161
  to explore 123-125
Fruit 138, 177, 271, 305, 379, 406
  and wholesome speech 191, 271
Fulfilment 95, 112, 139, 149, 158, 161, 207
  fulfilment of criteria 125
Future tense 402, 447

Galilee 397
Gamaliel 145
Geminate 117, 144-146
Genealogy 159
Genre 38, 42, 123, 164-169
Gentiles 74, 98, 106, 128, 132, 139, 158-160, 182, 207, 225, 270, 327, 356, 358, 363-364, 368-369, 418-419, 478
Glass-making 158
God 106, 137, 139, 156, 161, 181, 472, 477-481
  as source and cause 68
  God with us 157, 207
  unchanging authority 211
  divine glory 118, 128, 363
  divine rule 182
  divine will 199
  see Covenant, grace, mercy
Gospel of Thomas 72, 101, 130, 299, 325, 330, 348-349, 352-353, 355, 361, 367, 401, 410
Gospel (message) 133, 138
Grace 99-100, 138, 322, 372, 388, 418-421, 424, 470
  as mysterious as judgment 286
Greed 127
Greek
  grecisms 23, 176, 276
  world-play 29
Greek indexes 12
Greimas 126, 133

Hardening Theory 60, 284-286
Harmonization 16, 163, 372
Headline 128
Hearers 123-124, 150
Hebrew 52, 81-83, 145
Herod Antipas 267
Hillel 144
Hermeneutics 99, 101, 126, 368
  of suspicion 100
  new hermeneutic 63, 100, 135
History 94-95, 128, 142-143
  historicization 32

of salvation 44, 206-207, 323
Holy Spirit 18, 192, 199, 270-271
The Father's Spirit 199
seen in holiness of action 199
protection of the Spirit 111, 199, 282
for gentle victor 271
see Baptism
Homogenization 52, 169
Horace 47, 182
Horizon
extended horizons 126
Hortatory 73
Hospitality 258
Humility 158, 180, 225, 248, 271, 366
Humour 47, 124, 268
Hyperbole 182, 354
Hypocrisy 191, 439-441

Ideology 35, 123-124, 140-142
Idolatry 143, 214
Imagery 18, 95, 97-98, 109, 121-122, 129-130, 174, 178, 181
incremental imagery 178, 179
stone imagery 188
Imagination 34
Implied readers 200
Inclusio 26-28, 289
Incongruity 66, 68
Inconsistency (of style) 237-238
(of behaviour) 268, (of diction) 238
Inscriptions 69, 203
Institutionalization 109, 130
Instruments, musical 268
Interpretation 367
of parables 303-309, 316, 331-344, 358
Intertextuality 15, 126
Intralinguistic world 100
Israel 45, 131
Itinerant teachers 155

Jeremiah 164
Jerusalem 179, 375-377
Jerusalem Temple 145, 154, 184, 372, 373-376, 390
fall of 94, 226, 403, 425
Jerusalem as metaphor 363
Jesus 68, 130, 132, 142, 143, 188, 204, 250, 326, 328, 354, 363, 422
life and teaching of 127, 139, 214, 326, 369
teaching authority 118, 125, 185
prophetic authority 125, 139, 371, 384, 389
rejection of 18, 390
tradition of 115, 125-126, 130-131, 153, 245
movement 151, 155
and the time of the church 207, 249, 366
see Biography
John the Baptist 111, 190-191, 199, 225, 320, 357-358, 368, 378, 392, 397, 399-400
John the Baptist and Q 315
Josephus 42, 154, 176, 197, 202, 207, 212, 218, 333, 376, 383, 419
Joy 278, 411, 474
Judas Iscariot 227, 285
Judgment 86, 90, 97, 98, 114, 117, 128, 135, 141, 178, 225, 320, 345, 355, 461
Justice 106, 122, 136, 138, 141, 154, 199, 259
Justin, the Apologist 150

Kingdom 96, 101, 119, 128, 133-141,149,159-162, 198-200, 317, 329, 342, 388, 411
mystery (mysteries) of 310
the Father's will 125, 130, 137, 138, 155, 162, 179, 223, 243, 272, 359
and Jesus 137
and wisdom 180
conflict with evil 137, 272
and parables 128, 133-142
and this-worldly behaviour 137, 342-348
belongs to humble 156, 420
present Kingdom 388
see Obedience, Son of Man, Father, Gospel, Judgment, Justice, Evil, Holy Spirit, reversal motif

Law 118, 125, 140-142, 149, 207-208
radicalized 162, 215
and obedience 184
and humanitarian concern 192, 197, 365
simplified, internalized, completed 208
circumcision 208
ceremonial law 364-365
the commandments of Moses 369-370
Leviticus 22, 118, 140, 224-225
Lawlessness 141, 159, 214-215
Legitimation Document theory 47-48
Light 361-364, 454
Literary criticism

literary function 331
Little Ones 155-156, 192, 246-248
see Children
Loosing 22-23, 216
Lord's Supper 406
Love, acts of 241, 260-261
to the enemy 153, 247
Lucretius 182
Luke
Lucan parables 71-72, 74, 75, 78, 82, 88, 90, 96-97, 167-168, 179-183, 218, 272-281, 322-331, 393, 402-403, 405, 429, 444, 466-467, 469, 479
Lucan monologues 71, 305-312, 361-362, 370-371, 379-380
perseverance 299

Mark 96, 100
Marcan parables 281-312, 328
Mark II 30
Urmarkus 29
dualities 326
Matthew
priority of 29
special source 31
ideals 159
attitude to Law 364
attitude to Old Testament *see* Old Testament
attitude to evil *see* Evil
God with us
world view *see* World, Cosmology
universalism *see* judgment, history, world
Mekilta 83, 144
Memorization 40, 131, 163-164, 244
Mercy 92, 106, 122, 141, 154, 252
Merit 135, 460-462
Messengers 163, 282, 380-381, 403, 422
Messiah 185, 252, 284, 295
Metacriticism 126
Metaphor 62-66, 98
rhetorical trope 64
interaction theory 63
world-creating 63
catalyst of experience 63
narrated metaphor 133-135
emblematic 65, 68, 69, 72, 78, 98, 117, 120, 127, 146, 156, 184, 251, 278, 300, 323, 327
community bonding 67
interlocking systems 184
sunekdoche 121, 366
see polyvalence, simile, analogy
Minor Agreements 29-30, 36, 40, 53, 200, 213, 235, 341, 364, 391, 408
Mission 198-200, 245-246, 261, 442
Motifs
vegetative 58
Mystery 189, 198, 210, 302

Narrative 102-103, 133
narrative gaps 103-104
narrative theology 103-104
narrative terminology 176
narrative criticism 35
narrative flow 34, 123
reference levels 85, 128, 134, 135
gnostic narratives 103
see characterization, topical inserts 165, fiction, form criticism, autonomy, passion narrative, Wisdom
Negative evidence 33-34, 291-292
New Temple 185
Nominativus Pendens 176
Normative Judaism 143

Obedience 115, 117, 125, 137-138, 181-182, 187, 249, 389, 442
see watchfulness
Old Testament 126, 128, 132, 136, 145, 277-279, 282-283, 364, 367, 369, 373, 387-388
quotation of 120, 121, 193, 204, 215, 316
allusions to 59, 326, 372, 385, 407, 466
see hardening theory
Onomatopoeia 146, 455
Openness 108
Oppression 156, 163, 403
Orality 30, 36-40
see formulae, repetition
oral tradition 11, 53
non-literary orality 37
oral elements 177

Papyri 51, 202-203, 212, 221, 312, 361, 452, 465
Parables
definition of 56-109
function of 111-168
of Jesus 58-60
parabolic corpus 58
parabolic grouping 113

summary parables 142-143, 173-281
double parables 112, 183, 314, 324, 351, 362
triadic patterns 80, 113, 115, 147, 179, 313, 327, 372, 420, 429, 437
multiple parables 84, 113
parabolic introductions 177
antithetic parables 183
deparabolizing 431
see story, epic, geminate, form criticism, mystery, vision, epigram, hortatory
Paradox 182
Parataxis 297
Parousia 61, 71, 336-337, 377, 430, 445
delay of 62, 75-77, 436-440
Particles 27, 112, 187, 194, 211-213, 253, 269, 288-289, 333-340, 425-426, 446, 451
Passion narrative 119, 132, 150, 168, 213, 238-239, 244, 256, 265, 339, 385, 387, 392, 407, 418, 469
Paul 76, 284, 387, 398, 406, 431, 437
Performative language 97
Performance theory 57, 102, 109, 130
Periphrastic 216
Penitence 367
Peter 50, 118, 174, 185, 195, 199, 212, 216, 238, 277, 438
primacy of 18
Pharisees 45, 153-154, 197, 370
Philo 89, 203, 466
Philodemus 312
Piety
various kinds 197, 224, 392
Pirke Aboth 145-146, 441
Plato 255
Plautus 472
Pliny, the Younger 51, 159, 258-259
Plot 34, 115-116, 123-124, 127, 131-132, 136
Plutarch 42, 182, 441, 464
Poetic associations 297
Polyvalence 64, 248
Postmodernism 104-105
Praxis 104
Present Tense 233, 383, 455, 458
Principles of transformation 69-81
Promise 132, 162, 207, 386
Prophets 154-155, 401
prophetic drama 94-95, 139
prophetic oracles 93-95, 125, 145-146
oracles of judgment 183
false prophets 18, 193, 214, 277, 306, 425
rejection of prophets 380
Proverb 74, 95, 129-130, 182, 441
Providence 118, 130, 181, 353, 359
providential gifts 472
Psychology 133
Punishment 160, 137, 162
Purim 412

Q 122, 165
stratification of
and James 158
Qualities of life 111, 163, 199, 247-248
see mercy, righteous, just, speech, humility, Kingdom
Qumran 22, 24, 48, 78, 117, 184-185, 215, 336-337, 410, 440
Quintilian 79, 366

Rabbis 142, 144-148
rabbinic haggadah 82
rabbinic imagery 128-130
rabbinic instruction 83, 147
rabbinic parables 83, 114, 129, 141-146, 400, 412, 421
rabbinic texts 83
Pesiqta parables 85
Racial issue 390
Reader
implied 35
reader response 124-125
actual reader 35, 133
see hearers
Reality 65, 104
Realistic conflict theory 142
Redaction criticism 7-24, 227-239, 253, 287
see parataxis
Reincarnation 45
Relativization of values 126
Reminiscences of Q 20
Repetition 37-39, 184
Repentance 83, 96, 114, 279, 286, 345, 389, 406
Responsibility 75-76, 96, 107, 122, 123, 126, 137, 139, 151, 156, 161, 262, 284, 309, 319
Resurrection 45-46, 120
Retribution 181, 239
Revelation 96, 105, 112, 118-119, 148, 180, 185, 189, 192, 308
to the νήπιοι 190

Reversal/replacement motif 45, 75, 113-114, 163, 413
reversal of vocation 139, 386, 389, 405, 408, 413, 474
reversal of values 141, 157, 351, 366
reversal of fortunes 213, 298, 413
see Children, Little Ones
Reward 106, 115, 119, 141, 144, 162, 249, 359, 415-422
Rhetoric 148, 289
climax 33, 177, 184, 257
climactic divider 32
epithet 38
echo 41
collatio 119, 252
repetition 35, 39
repetition with variation 182
contrast 35
comparison 35
climatic dividers 32
paradox 180
periphrasis 195
'crescendo effect' 238
sunekdoche 366
see temporal ordering, plot, repetition, foreshadowings, flash-backs, anticipations, form criticism, assonance, onomatopoeia, alliteration, assonance, hyperbole.
Riddle 90, 118, 121, 148, 150, 210
Righteous 155, 184, 342, 464

Sadducees 27, 274, 445
Scribe 118, 142, 149, 150, 153, 155, 189-211
Semitisms 10, 23, 198, 325, 330, 373
Seneca 257
Sermon on the Mount 116-118, 121-122, 128
Servant 136, 148, 156, 379, 413
Shammai 144
Shame 157, 396
Sick-visiting societies 258
Simile 66
Slavery 50, 150, 159-161
slaves 98-99, 379, 441
Sleep 430, 444, 457
Social critique
Social identity theory 142
Sociology 47, 141-161, 250
Son of David 190
Son of God 96, 125, 139, 148, 189, 282, 382, 442
the beloved Son 149, 381
humility of 191, 204
universal authority 187
benefits and privileges 286
see revelation, Kingdom
Son of Man 98, 115, 119, 137, 139, 152, 211, 268, 342, 413, 442
a lonely migrant 156, 199, 364-365
future confirmation 187
his future coming as judge 126, 168, 226-227, 229, 237, 246, 343, 431
the sovereignty of the crucified 139, 202
his throne 233, 236
shared authority 237
his kingdom 342-344
Sophocles 393
Source criticism 82, 110-115, 175, 378-379
Jerusalem school 81
Lucerne school 83-84
defining written sources 173, 312-313
see Streeter hypothesis
Speech
Wholesome 192
Statistical evidence 9
Story 102, 113, 123, 125-127, 131, 133
Oriental story-telling 193
see Treasure Trove
Streeter hypothesis 54, 113, 115
Structure
thematic 33, 117
conceptual 33
numerical 33
see topic
Structuralism 1, 123-133, 218
deep structure 126-128, 131
Superscriptions 32
Syllable counting 184, 453, 460
Symbols 100, 118, 427
tensive 5
Synagogues 17, 48-49, 142, 389
Synoptics
map of usage 15-16
Syriac 21

Talmud 21, 144
Tannaim 144
Tarfon 144, 422
Tatian 42, 350
Targum 248, 308, 384, 404
Teachers
false teachers 306

Testament of 12 Patriarchs 118, 213, 217, 223, 232, 258, 277, 307, 336, 417
Textual criticism 10, 116, 178, 219-222, 334, 347, 377, 387-388, 393-398, 409, 416, 458, 468, 471
Theodicy 44, 344
Time
  temporal ordering 34
  time references 14, 418
Tithes 153
Torah *see* Law
Tobit 44, 177, 270
Topic 17, 31-32
  definition of 32
Trade 50, 158
Translation 62, 69-70
  see Aramaic, Greek, Hebrew
Treasure trove 127, 345-350
  finding and searching 352
Truth 69

Understanding 118-119, 124, 201, 209-210
Universal judgment 152, 160, 229, 251, 259, 342
Urban setting 131, 148, 152, 157-158
Urevangelium 81

Vergil 255
Violence 156, 163, 199, 403, 439
Vision Interpretation 79, 152, 159-160, 242-245, 301-302, 428

Watchfulness 114, 119, 135, 136-137, 226, 320, 432-434
  accountable stewardship 466
Wealth 93, 98, 157, 348, 353
Wirkungsgeschichte 105-107
Wisdom 24, 74, 90, 111, 117-118, 125, 129-130, 136, 143-146, 178, 180, 182, 284, 341, 361, 367, 402, 435-436, 438, 452
  terminology 176
  work of renewal 266
  rejection of Wisdom 268, 283
  narrative 270
  morality 117
  of this world 182
Word
  of God 63
  word fields 128, 131
  final word 137
World 128, 335, 343, 360
  world view 130-131, 166
Worship 67, 128, 149, 187, 360-364, 372
  and Ethics 363

SUPPLEMENTS TO NOVUM TESTAMENTUM

ISSN 0167-9732

2. STROBEL, A. *Untersuchungen zum eschatologischen Verzögerungsproblem auf Grund der spätjüdische-urchristlichen Geschichte von Habakuk 2,2 ff.* 1961. ISBN 90 04 01582 5
6. *Neotestamentica et Patristica.* Eine Freundesgabe Herrn Professor Dr. Oscar Cullmann zu seinem 60. Geburtstag überreicht. 1962. ISBN 90 04 01586 8
8. DE MARCO, A.A. *The Tomb of Saint Peter.* A Representative and Annotated Bibliography of the Excavations. 1964. ISBN 90 04 01588 4
10. BORGEN, P. *Bread from Heaven.* An Exegetical Study of the Concept of Manna in the Gospel of John and the Writings of Philo. Photomech. Reprint of the first (1965) edition. 1981. ISBN 90 04 06419 2
13. MOORE, A.L. *The Parousia in the New Testament.* 1966. ISBN 90 04 01593 0
15. QUISPEL, G. *Makarius, das Thomasevangelium und das Lied von der Perle.* 1967. ISBN 90 04 01595 7
16. PFITZNER, V.C. *Paul and the Agon Motif.* 1967. ISBN 90 04 01596 5
17. BELLINZONI, A. *The Sayings of Jesus in the Writings of Justin Martyr.* 1967. ISBN 90 04 01597 3
18. GUNDRY, R.H. *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel.* With Special Reference to the Messianistic Hope. Reprint of the first (1967) edition. 1975. ISBN 90 04 04278 4
19. SEVENSTER, J.N. *Do You Know Greek?* How Much Greek Could the first Jewish Christians Have Known? 1968. ISBN 90 04 03090 5
20. BUCHANAN, G.W. *The Consequences of the Covenant.* 1970. ISBN 90 04 01600 7
21. KLIJN, A.F.J. *A Survey of the Researches into the Western Text of the Gospels and Acts.* Part 2: 1949-1969. 1969. ISBN 90 04 01601 5
22. GABOURY, A. *La Stucture des Évangiles synoptiques.* La structure-type à l'origine des synoptiques. 1970. ISBN 90 04 01602 3
23. GASTON, L. *No Stone on Another.* Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels. 1970. ISBN 90 04 01603 1
24. *Studies in John.* Presented to Professor Dr. J.N. Sevenster on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday. 1970. ISBN 90 04 03091 3
25. STORY, C.I.K. *The Nature of Truth in the 'Gospel of Truth', and in the Writings of Justin Martyr.* A Study of the Pattern of Orthodoxy in the Middle of the Second Christian Century. 1970. ISBN 90 04 01605 8
26. GIBBS, J.G. *Creation and Redemption.* A Study in Pauline Theology. 1971. ISBN 90 04 01606 6
27. MUSSIES, G. *The Morphology of Koine Greek As Used in the Apocalypse of St. John.* A Study in Bilingualism. 1971. ISBN 90 04 02656 8
28. AUNE, D.E. *The Cultic Setting of Realized Eschatology in Early Christianity.* 1972. ISBN 90 04 03341 6
29. UNNIK, W.C. VAN. *Sparsa Collecta.* The Collected Essays of W.C. van Unnik Part 1. Evangelia, Paulina, Acta. 1973. ISBN 90 04 03660 1
30. UNNIK, W.C. VAN. *Sparsa Collecta.* The Collected Essays of W.C. van Unnik Part 2. I Peter, Canon, Corpus Hellenisticum, Generalia. 1980. ISBN 90 04 06261 0
31. UNNIK, W.C. VAN. *Sparsa Collecta.* The Collected Essays of W.C. van Unnik Part 3. Patristica, Gnostica, Liturgica. 1983. ISBN 90 04 06262 9

33. AUNE D.E. (ed.) *Studies in New Testament and Early Christian Literature.* Essays in Honor of Allen P. Wikgren. 1972. ISBN 90 04 03504 4
34. HAGNER, D.A. *The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome.* 1973. ISBN 90 04 03636 9
35. GUNTHER, J.J. *St. Paul's Opponents and Their Background.* A Study of Apocalyptic and Jewish Sectarian Teachings. 1973. ISBN 90 04 03738 1
36. KLIJN, A.F.J. & G.J. REININK (eds.) *Patristic Evidence for Jewish-Christian Sects.* 1973. ISBN 90 04 03763 2
37. REILING, J. *Hermas and Christian Prophecy.* A Study of The Eleventh Mandate. 1973. ISBN 90 04 03771 3
38. DONFRIED, K.P. *The Setting of Second Clement in Early Christianity.* 1974. ISBN 90 04 03895 7
39. ROON, A. VAN. *The Authenticity of Ephesians.* 1974. ISBN 90 04 03971 6
40. KEMMLER, D.W. *Faith and Human Reason.* A Study of Paul's Method of Preaching as Illustrated by 1-2 Thessalonians and Acts 17, 2-4. 1975. ISBN 90 04 04209 1
42. PANCARO, S. *The Law in the Fourth Gospel.* The Torah and the Gospel, Moses and Jesus, Judaism and Christianity According to John. 1975. ISBN 90 04 04309 8
43. CLAVIER, H. *Les variétés de la pensée biblique et le problème de son unité.* Esquisse d'une théologie de la Bible sur les textes originaux et dans leur contexte historique. 1976. ISBN 90 04 04465 5
44. ELLIOTT, J.K.E. (ed.) *Studies in New Testament Language and Text.* Essays in Honour of George D. Kilpatrick on the Occasion of His Sixty-fifth Birthday. 1976. ISBN 90 04 04386 1
45. PANAGOPOULOS, J. (ed.) *Prophetic Vocation in the New Testament and Today.* 1977. ISBN 90 04 04923 1
46. KLIJN, A.F.J. *Seth in Jewish, Christian and Gnostic Literature.* 1977. ISBN 90 04 05245 3
47. BAARDA, T., A.F.J. KLIJN & W.C. VAN UNNIK (eds.) *Miscellanea Neotestamentica.* I. Studia ad Novum Testamentum Praesertim Pertinentia a Sociis Sodalicii Batavi c.n. Studiosorum Novi Testamenti Conventus Anno MCMLXXVI Quintum Lustrum Feliciter Complentis Suscepta. 1978. ISBN 90 04 05685 8
48. BAARDA, T. A.F.J. KLIJN & W.C. VAN UNNIK (eds.) *Miscellanea Neotestamentica.* II. 1978. ISBN 90 04 05686 6
49. O'BRIEN, P.T. *Introductory Thanksgivings in the Letters of Paul.* 1977. ISBN 90 04 05265 8
50. BOUSSET, D.W. *Religionsgeschichtliche Studien.* Aufsätze zur Religionsgeschichte des hellenistischen Zeitalters. Hrsg. von A.F. Verheule. 1979. ISBN 90 04 05845 1
51. COOK, M.J. *Mark's Treatment of the Jewish Leaders.* 1978. ISBN 90 04 05785 4
52. GARLAND, D.E. *The Intention of Matthew 23.* 1979. ISBN 90 04 05912 1
53. MOXNES, H. *Theology in Conflict.* Studies in Paul's Understanding of God in Romans. 1980. ISBN 90 04 06140 1
55. MENKEN, M.J.J. *Numerical Literary Techniques in John.* The Fourth Evangelist's Use of Numbers of Words and Syllables. 1985. ISBN 90 04 07427 9
56. SKARSAUNE, O. *The Proof From Prophecy.* A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition: Text-type, Provenance, Theological Profile. 1987. ISBN 90 04 07468 6
59. WILKINS, M.J. *The Concept of Disciple in Matthew's Gospel, as Reflected in the Use of the Term 'Mathetes'.* 1988. ISBN 90 04 08689 7
60. MILLER, E.L. *Salvation-History in the Prologue of John.* The Significance of John 1: 3-4. 1989. ISBN 90 04 08692 7
61. THIELMAN, F. *From Plight to Solution.* A Jewish Framework for Understanding Paul's View of the Law in Galatians and Romans. 1989. ISBN 90 04 09176 9

64. STERLING, G.E. *Historiography and Self-Definition.* Josephos, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography. 1992. ISBN 90 04 09501 2
65. BOTHA, J.E. *Jesus and the Samaritan Woman.* A Speech Act Reading of John 4:1-42. 1991. ISBN 90 04 09505 5
66. KUCK, D.W. *Judgment and Community Conflict.* Paul's Use of Apologetic Judgment Language in 1 Corinthians 3:5-4:5. 1992. ISBN 90 04 09510 1
67. SCHNEIDER, G. *Jesusüberlieferung und Christologie.* Neutestamentliche Aufsätze 1970-1990. 1992. ISBN 90 04 09555 1
68. SEIFRID, M.A. *Justification by Faith.* The Origin and Development of a Central Pauline Theme. 1992. ISBN 90 04 09521 7
69. NEWMAN, C.C. *Paul's Glory-Christology.* Tradition and Rhetoric. 1992. ISBN 90 04 09463 6
70. IRELAND, D.J. *Stewardship and the Kingdom of God.* An Historical, Exegetical, and Contextual Study of the Parable of the Unjust Steward in Luke 16: 1-13. 1992. ISBN 90 04 09600 0
71. ELLIOTT, J.K. *The Language and Style of the Gospel of Mark.* An Edition of C.H. Turner's "Notes on Marcan Usage" together with other comparable studies. 1993. ISBN 90 04 09767 8
72. CHILTON, B. *A Feast of Meanings.* Eucharistic Theologies from Jesus through Johannine Circles. 1994. ISBN 90 04 09949 2
73. GUTHRIE, G.H. *The Structure of Hebrews.* A Text-Linguistic Analysis. 1994. ISBN 90 04 09866 6
74. BORMANN, L., K. DEL TREDICI & A. STANDHARTINGER (eds.) *Religious Propaganda and Missionary Competition in the New Testament World.* Essays Honoring Dieter Georgi. 1994. ISBN 90 04 10049 0
75. PIPER, R.A. (ed.) *The Gospel Behind the Gospels.* Current Studies on Q. 1995. ISBN 90 04 09737 6
76. PEDERSEN, S. (ed.) *New Directions in Biblical Theology.* Papers of the Aarhus Conference, 16-19 September 1992. 1994. ISBN 90 04 10120 9
77. JEFFORD, C.N. (ed.) *The* Didache *in Context.* Essays on Its Text, History and Transmission. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10045 8
78. BORMANN, L. *Philippi – Stadt und Christengemeinde zur Zeit des Paulus.* 1995. ISBN 90 04 10232 9
79. PETERLIN, D. *Paul's Letter to the Philippians in the Light of Disunity in the Church.* 1995. ISBN 90 04 10305 8
80. JONES, I.H. *The Matthean Parables.* A Literary and Historical Commentary. 1995 ISBN 90 04 10181 0
81. GLAD, C.E. *Paul and Philodemus.* Adaptability in Epicurean and Early Christian Psychagogy. 1995 ISBN 90 04 10067 9